

AMERICA. Published weekly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., April 2, 1938, Vol. LVIII, No. 26, Whole No. 1486. Telephone Barclay 7-8993. Cable Address: Cathreview. United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly \$4.00; Canada, \$4.50; Europe, \$5.00. Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. AMERICA, A Catholic Review of the Week, Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

COMMENT

NO protests, no exclamations of horror are heard from the press, from supposed liberals, from groups of non-Catholic clergymen over the dynamiting by Government forces of a building in Madrid which contained several hundred friends of the Franco regime. But the very periodicals which carried the picture of this terrific occurrence carried dozens of outraged alarms over the bombing of Barcelona. His Eminence, Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, was severely reproached for daring to suggest that General Franco might have had some reason for this bombing other than the supposed lust for killing women and children. As the facts pierce the fog and the truth begins to appear, the Cardinal's supposition, strange as it may sound, seems to have some grounding. More news of the military objectives in Barcelona has recently come to light, confirming what AMERICA noted a couple of weeks ago on this same subject. However much we may deplore and utterly detest the conditions which have linked the horrors of bombing to modern warfare, the grim fact still remains that it is the outstanding means for depriving an enemy of the war resources which, if left in his possession, only assist an indefinite prolongation of the war and a consequent series of even greater horrors. Among these objectives are enumerated a seminary in which was installed anti-aircraft artillery and large deposits of war material at the University; bomb factories; cartridge and other munition factories; series of scattered anti-aircraft batteries around the city; headquarters of the anarchist and Communist forces; different military headquarters; principal electric transformer stations; warehouses and other storage places for munitions, etc. Locations of all these are exactly specified. As long as even a fraction of these objectives is found to have existed, the bombing of Barcelona cannot be charged as it is now being charged wholly to ruthless cruelty and disregard for the necessities of warfare.

— — —

INSTRUCTIONS to his clergy issued by Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster, forbidding Catholics to take part in the Buchmanite or so-called Oxford Group Movement are a much-needed answer to a doubt that has perplexed many Catholics in this country and abroad. The condemnation touches precisely upon the point which is completely overlooked by the Oxford Group enthusiasts, bent upon sweeping Catholics into their peculiar form of individualistic renewal. He says: "The Group Movement is so tainted with indifferentism, i.e. with the error that one religion is as good as another, that no Catholic may take any active part therein or formally cooperate therewith." The Cardinal's action was a sequel to an

attempt that had been made in France and elsewhere to make use of his name in a supposed approval of the Movement. The confusion which besets the minds of the Oxford enthusiasts is by no means shared by all the leading non-Catholics in this country who strive to promote cooperation between their various bodies and the Catholic Church in areas, such as that of civic reform and defense of public morals, where such cooperation is useful and necessary. Many of these leaders clearly recognize the consistency of the Catholic attitude on indifferentism, and the National Conference of Jews and Christians expressly repudiates anything approaching an assumption of indifferentism between the cooperating religious bodies. Cardinal Hinsley's instructions will still further clarify a situation concerning which Catholics must necessarily walk cautiously if their position and motives are not to give scandal or be misunderstood.

— — —

APPOINTMENT of a three-man committee by the President to report within a week on recommendations "for immediate action by Congress in regard to the whole railroad situation, which is critical" has produced rather favorable public reaction. The appointment from one viewpoint may look puerile, a teacher appointing a given time for the class to report on some intricate problem. Viewed in its proper perspective, however, such is not the present case. Really there has been study and research in abundance and a number of alternatives have been proposed. So the work of the Committee narrows down to the recommendation of the most helpful or least revolutionary of the schemes contemplated. There will be no hearings of testimony. That stage has been already passed. All feel that the railroad situation has reached a critical pass and that not good but further evil can result from further delay and study. The prevailing opinion seemed to be that the chief need was legislation to make the managements concerned adjust themselves to competitive conditions. Pooling of arrangements leading to elimination of duplicating services, coordination of terminal and other facilities were expected to help in saving the roads and providing a fair return on re-evaluated properties.

— — —

METROPOLITAN papers have generally disassociated themselves from the appointment of a Communist as an appointee and salary drawer of the administration of New York City. Not so the tabloid, *Daily News*, which hopes in an editorial of March 22, that Gerson's sponsor will hold out against the organized opposition pressure to the appointment. In that same editorial it took exception to form and substance of the McNaboe-De-

vaney bill just passed at Albany to bar Communists in the future from civil service jobs. The arguments employed against the bill are of the kind we are accustomed to expect from such a source. But the editorial goes further and champions not only Isaacs and Gerson, but Communism itself. There is something good in Communism and America would be poorer, deprived of its invigorating modicum or particle of good. It is only an accident that Communism has not worked well in Russia; that is due to the cruel, blood-thirsty nature of the Russians. By that line of argument Communism may well be essentially good and only evil by the accident of place. And then instead of an analysis of Communism to prove the point, the editorial side-tracks on TVA and other socializing American schemes. The whole philosophy back of this, and that goes for most of the *News* editorials, is what is, is and hence acceptable and good. Nor should the concluding flip that such an editorial could not be printed in Russia because it says Communism is only partly right, hide the views in this tabloid's editorial opinion. When one considers the daily food thus handed out to some million readers and their flagrantly sensational lurid reporting of sex crimes or crimes made out to be such, it should not be hard to decide what is the worst single influence to sound thinking and sound morality in New York today.

— — —

PARADOXES created by our actual social system are increasing in their perplexity. The problem of "the man over forty" in business, trade and in factory meets one from every angle. A good case for the employer in the speeded-up industries can be made. The unskilled and semi-skilled workers, the largest group of the workers, are made the heaviest victims of the present system. But there are complications on every side. In services where the reasons assigned by the industries for early retirement assuredly do not hold, insurance, pensions and security legislation offer the employer efficacious motives for evading responsibility to a capable, honest worker. The five-day week does not seem to offer any stabilization of employment in the light of the last century. The declining birth rate, effected mainly by birth prevention and practically necessitated in the eyes of many by the same economic system, aggravates this same problem. At present out of every 1,000 persons in this country 260 are forty or more years old. By 1960 it is estimated thirty-six per cent of the population will be between forty and sixty-five years old. Is the extension of human life by a longer life expectancy to become an added problem for millions? What will the added years and the shorter week mean for the many employes whose only hope for the future has rested on interest in their work and security in old age?

— — —

RECENTLY a devout Anglican attended a performance of the excellent motion picture, *Monastery*, which depicts the life of the Trappist monks. He returned enthusiastic about the picture, which

he entitled a "grand piece of work," and was grateful to his Catholic wife for bringing him to see it. On one point only was he slightly mystified. In the latter half of the picture, showing life in a Trappist monastery in France, there is a scene taken in the library, in the course of which one of the monks is seen going to a shelf, taking down a large and learned-looking volume and reading it. In the course of this scene the audience is shown a glimpse of the title of the book. It reads *Opera D. Johannis Fell, Episcopi Oxoniensis*. Further inquiry by the said Anglican gentleman led to the information that Dr. John Fell (1625-1686) was Bishop of the diocese of Oxford, founded by that distinguished monarch, Henry VIII. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* Dr. Fell was principally known for a work entitled: *Seasonable Advice to Protestants Showing the Necessity of Maintaining the Established Religion in Opposition to Popery*. To the Anglican gentleman's inquiry as to why a Trappist monk should be regaling himself on such unorthodox fare, the obvious answer is that being by monastic profession and possibly by natural inclination a charitable person, this good monk wished to show a little leniency to the literary remains of one whose memory has suffered three centuries from a universal dislike, the reason for which no one could tell. Having examined the good Doctor's works, the monk can now state the reason for this dislike, and the Doctor may more tranquilly rest wherever he may be located in the other world.

— — —

THERE is something hypocritical or obtuse—or is it a blind spot?—on the part of the State Department that it sees murder and arson in the recent air raids of Barcelona, a city that is anything but unfortified and non-combatant, and for the past fifteen and more months has not been able to recognize that ruthless murders have incessantly taken place in Government-controlled territory. Did Mr. Cordell Hull voice indignant protest at the slaughter of men, women and children during all these days in Communist-ruled Spain, when innocents were "liquidated" (a Russian word for murder) either for holding or on suspicion of holding political opinions contrary to those of the Red horde that has deluged the country in blood? The attested number of known victims of this inhuman "liquidating" process has mounted into the hundreds of thousands, and our State Department has not expressed a word of remonstrance. There is no thought here of excusing, extenuating or exculpating the recent bombings along the Catalonian seaboard. But the inconsistency of the State Department's recent public statement would make one surmise that the same sinister forces, which compromised some sixty Congressmen into signing a document of greeting and endorsement of the Barcelona Government, have now turned their efforts on the Department of State. It would be better for that Department to stand steadfastly in speech also well as action by the neutrality laws enacted by Congress.

LABORER AND LAWYER: EQUALITY IN SOCIAL CASTE

An inquiry into the Catholic attitude on workingmen

JOHN P. DELANEY

CONSIDER the very deeply entrenched heresy that there is something shameful about manual labor. In its American form, this heresy is not expressed in those exact words; but it underlies a great deal of our pride in America as the land of opportunity, where every boy may cherish the ambition to become president, and every girl the president's wife. Our national heroes are the men who have "risen" from the laboring class to big business, to politics, to art. In our American philosophy, a man indulges in manual labor because he has neither the ambition nor the ability to "better" himself; or he is using manual labor as a means, patiently bearing the stigma of being a laborer until he can attain to the intrinsically higher dignity of a white-collar job. Our very interpretation of the phrase "to better himself" is indicative of our philosophy of labor. When we say that a man betters himself, we do not mean that he improves his knowledge of his trade, that he improves his general culture; we do not mean financial, material, moral, intellectual improvement in the sphere he occupies. We mean that he moves out of that sphere into what, without reason, is considered an intrinsically higher sphere.

Against this philosophy, it is true, we do at times argue in a rather negative way when we speak of the dignity of manual labor, when we preach of Christ the Workingman, Christ the Carpenter. But even then our purpose and our idea has been to inculcate rather patience than pride, to induce people to bear with their condition, as something to be tolerated temporarily, rather than as a state to be permanently chosen, a lofty thing, a vocation in the fullest sense of the word. In our thousand and one yearly commencement addresses, we have become accustomed to the enumeration of the vocations of doctor, lawyer, engineer, priest; but how often do we hear commencement speakers extol the vocation of manual labor?

Unfortunately, the American heresy has poisoned Catholic minds, and consciously or unconsciously we too have come to look on manual labor as something undesirable, at best a make-shift, a stepping-stone. Only recently I had occasion to realize how deep-rooted were my own prejudices on the subject. During a long conversation with a

young French Catholic labor leader, I had remarked the depth and breadth of his education and culture, his familiarity with the topics of the day, with literature, sociology, economics. During the conversation the question was continually in my mind—why is this young man *merely* a workingman? Why has he not "bettered" himself? Finally I asked the question, and knew at once that I had asked a question that, coming from a priest, was actually shocking. Perhaps he excused me as being an American. At any rate, his answer was perfect in its simplicity, Catholic to the core: "But I am a workingman. That's what I wish to be. It's my vocation!"

Another Frenchman, father of two young boys, confided to a priest his ambition for his children: "I want to see them either priests or leaders of workingmen; but whatever God wills, every day of my life, I pray that they may never wish to step out of the class of workingmen."

Certainly we are bound to admit that practical difficulties have tended to foster this philosophy: long hours of labor, meager pay, unsanitary conditions, slums, poor living. Such being the lot of the workingman, no wonder a man of ambition or pride would seek to rise above it; no wonder that a father of a family determines that such shall not be the lot of his children. But one may ask whether the conditions have engendered the mentality, or is it the mentality that has been a cause of these conditions.

In considering the causes of the unjust treatment meted out to labor, we cannot justly omit the low esteem in which labor has been held for generations. If we had had the right view of manual labor, we could not have treated our workers so. But manual labor has been a sort of necessary purgatory leading to a white-collar heaven. Being a passing stage, even workingmen themselves have been interested in labor movements only as long as the movement and the improvements brought about were necessary to their own advancement. Capable labor leaders have risen among the masses, but, since they were laborers by necessity and not by vocation, the offer of another position lifted them out of the working class, and out of all interest in the concerns of the laboring class, to be-

come not infrequently in turn, exploiters of labor.

Thus, labor has always been drained of its skill and its brains, leaving leadership in the hands of men less capable, almost always self-seeking. If, however, a new mentality should be formed, if labor should become a vocation, a stable, enduring profession with all the pride of profession, surely labor's efforts towards betterment would be more persistent, more unified, more effective. If labor leaders were proud to be laborers and leaders of laborers, to have thus the confidence and charge of a highly esteemed class of society, it would not take labor long to gain its rightful share of the world's goods, of the world's leisure, the world's respect. Is it too much to say that labor will never have the requisite number of unselfish, intelligent leaders of high ideals until manual labor takes its place among the honorable and desirable professions, until workingmen give their lives to labor as others give their lives to medicine, law or science?

But at once the cry of caste will be raised. Why condemn any group of men to the laboring class and grant to others the privilege of the upper classes? The very objection is proof of an existing caste that we would like to abolish. The use of the word *condemn* proves that we are here dealing with a deep-rooted idea of caste that can only be abolished by removing the stigma from labor and the laborers. It is not a question of condemning a man to a lower class. Labor is not a lower class. Remove the remaining difficulties of low pay and unfair conditions, (and this is not impossible!) and why should manual labor constitute a lower class?

Far from inculcating a system of class, the desire to make of labor a vocation, the desire to develop the stability of a self-respecting, prideful, educated laboring class is the surest means of removing a stupid mental caste system, for it removes the philosophical basis of such a system. Some men are more gifted mentally, some physically. Some are by nature better fitted for manual labor, some for intellectual labor; but why should we consider the latter intrinsically a more worthy member of society? Why should a mother or father feel ashamed of a son because he cannot gain as high marks for mental gymnastics as others?

As long as a man is performing a useful and honorable function in society, he has a right to hold up his head, the equal of any of his fellows. He has a right not only to a living wage, but to such a wage, as Pius XI teaches, as will enable him to build up a modest fortune, to become himself a property owner. He has a right to his hours of leisure, to his recreation and his education, to the respect of his fellow men. Surely in God's sight, his labor is not less worthy because it is manual. The Church honors Saint Thomas of the angelic intellect and Saint Joseph of the workshop; and Saint Joseph is no less a patron for those who work with their intellects than for those who work with their hands. When we can see in one and the same family (as we see in the family of the Church) one son a doctor, one a scientist, another a manual laborer, and each accounted equally a "success," then we can say that caste and the caste system

have disappeared. But as long as every workingman's ambition is to "rise" above manual labor, we are and will remain victims of a caste mentality.

For years America has relied on immigration to furnish a goodly portion of her manual laborers; and, because of this or causing this, we have the typical American attitude that the American of the second or third generation is above manual labor. Immigration has ceased. Manual labor must go on. This points inevitably to the formation of a stable American working class. And this formation faces us with a task and a problem. Catholics must help to form that class. We may continue to consider manual labor as a sort of failure's refuge, as a sign of lack of ambition, of inability, the manual laborer as society's lowest class; and thus build up a working class discontented, despised, rebellious, a ready prey to Communism and revolution.

Or we can rise above the philosophy of the day, preach manual labor as an honorable vocation, a life freely chosen according to man's aptitudes and desires, we can induce some of our best and finest young men to adopt this vocation; and thus we can build up a working class, proud of its function in society, contented with its chosen task, unenvious of those who fill other functions, self-respecting, educated.

A nation's stability depends in great part on the stability of its working class. Today more than ever, the working class is forming its own mentality; less than ever is it accepting the ideas or the leadership of other classes. This lays upon us the obligation of revising our ideas of education, especially the education of the elite. There must be education of an elite in art, in politics, in intellectual pursuits; but there must also be an education of the elite among the workingmen. That elite must be a sturdy group of Catholic workingmen; and we can only form that group by imbuing Catholic workingmen with the vocation idea of labor, by educating Catholic workingmen to choose a life of manual labor willingly, joyfully, pridefully, permanently, conscious that in manual labor they have found the road that God wishes them to follow to their eternal salvation.

Perhaps, here too, Communism is ahead of us with its principle of solidarity, its extensive plans for an education proper to the workingman, its manifold activities to fill the workers' leisure hours. But fortunately, not too far ahead of us. In France and Belgium, the J. O. C. (Catholic Young Workers) and the L. O. C. (League of Christian Workers), a more mature counterpart of the J. O. C., have been founded on the Catholic principle of the vocation and the stability of manual labor. The idea has taken fire and spread with a rapidity and an enthusiasm that makes of French workers the envy of the Communists, the strength and hope of the Church. Is the idea impossible among us?

The Communist doctrine of labor is founded on envy and hate. The Catholic doctrine of labor is founded on duty and love. And above all Communism has no Christ, the Workingman, to teach the divine dignity of labor, to call gently the workingmen into His vineyard of manual labor.

THE POPULAR FRONT IS BALONEY

The lure of the false-face of peace and democracy

GAULT MACGOWAN

"LONG live the Popular Front, in France and throughout the world, which unites the people solidly for democracy and peace!" Inspiring words these; the message, perhaps, for which the world has been waiting: a popular movement that will give us freedom to live our lives and to worship as we would wish under the heavenly gift of peace on earth, good-will to men.

So it seems. But alas! there is a catch in it. The quotation is the tailpiece from a manifesto addressed to the party congress of the Communist party of France by the Communist parties of the United States and Canada. The full text appeared in the *Daily Worker* (January 17), signed by William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Robert Minor, Alexander Tractenberg, Tim Buck and Jack Davis. Two lines preceding the stirring quotation on democracy and peace contain these words: "Long live the Communist Party of France, and its Bolshevik leadership! Long live the Communist International, the guarantee of world victory!"

The juxtaposition of these two quotations is worth the serious notice of all who believe that Bolshevism and democracy are very different things. Ever since the establishment of the Popular Front, a serious attempt has been made to parade it as a form of democratic activity. These two quotations show plainly the fraud that is being prepared for the public.

In my mailbox a few days ago was a harmless looking circular inviting me to attend a meeting of a local branch of the League for Democracy and Peace. Thanks to the manifesto in the *Daily Worker*, I did not go. But many people undoubtedly attended in the belief that they were invited to a non-partisan gathering for the promotion of good-will. What is the object of so deceiving the public? The answer is that the Bolsheviks have found that the path to world domination is not so easy as they hoped. Workers persist in their faith in social justice through other channels than Stalin. So the leaders are looking up the advice of their founding father.

Lenin wrote: "Focus your attention on searching out forms of approach to the proletarian revolution; it may be that the Popular Front Government will prove to be one of the most important

transitional forms." It turned out to be so in Spain. It aimed to be so in France. And now the seeds are being sedulously sown here to create a Popular Front in the name of Democracy and of Peace. The promoters evidently bank on the fact that the mass of the people does not read the *Daily Worker*, and is not forewarned. The Popular Front in Spain and in France was a trick to induce Liberals and Socialists to play along with Communists until they were committed so far to the Communist policy that they could not escape. The invariable result is that the Communist group dominates the party policy, even to the extent of ousting their former allies.

This is, of course, political chicanery of the vilest degree, but it makes one understand what President Roosevelt meant when he stressed the necessity of preserving "the integrity of the morals of democracy." There are those who argue that the Communists are too small a section of democracy ever to sway a representative government. But that argument loses sight of the fact that the whole technique of Communism is to teach the manifestation of a power out of all proportion to its dynamo. Give the Communists one seat in a left-wing council and it will not be long before the Communist is chairman. A few filibusters and they put him there to keep him quiet.

But they need not go so far. In a left-wing government, which ordinarily starts off with a Radical or a Socialist as its nominal head, the Communist asks only the control of one important portfolio of State. The nominal head of the government usually yields to the demand because he wants to placate the more militant and more vociferous elements in the party front; besides he needs a left-wing lieutenant capable of controlling those noisy elements, for once they have tasted of the bounty of the state their appetite increases daily. So he appoints the Communist leader to a public office.

Once in an office of state, for example the Department of Labor, of War, or of the Navy, the Communist deputy surrounds himself with party members and plays patronage to its limit. The conservative elements among permanent officials are swiftly retired to make room for junior men

schooled in left-wing principles. In the army and navy, officers are promoted to senior posts, not on merit but because of their political pliability. Swiftly the whole character of the administration of the department or departments is changed. The march then begins on the others until the entire administration is under control.

It is part of the technique of a Bolshevik revolution to induce soldiers and sailors to shoot their officers at the signal for rising. An important point in Communist strategy therefore is to make the officers unpopular with the rank and file. The task is part of the duty assigned to the period under which the country is under Popular Front rule. The quickest way of achieving this end is to promote the most unpopular officers in the services to high commands and to give them orders to tighten up discipline. The growth of Communism in the ranks is the reason given them for the necessity of tightening up discipline! It is a vicious circle. If the good officers and the sensible men see through it and try to cut it, they are, of course, Fascists! That makes them unpopular, and prepares the way for their exit.

Democracy in this country is on the eve of a similar missionary endeavor directed by the Comintern. In paying lip-service to the ideals of democracy, the Reds frankly admit their hypocrisy. Last September, in *The Modern Monthly*, a radical magazine, published here in New York, appeared the following lines signed by Anita Brenner, a Trotskyite: "Spain must become a worker's and peasant's Spain and not a democratic Spain which would mean nothing more than a Spain that had become a pawn in the hands of the Capitalists and the counter-Red Stalin degree."

This is exactly of what the Italians, Portuguese and Germans complain. They say in effect: "Under the pretense of the Popular Front, Russia wanted to get her hands on Spain. She substituted for a moderate republican form of government elected by universal suffrage, a government which no longer convened the Cortes, but was subservient in domestic affairs to the dictatorship of the bolshevized labor unions, and in foreign affairs to the dictatorship of the Comintern and the Russian envoy in Madrid, Marcel Rosenberg. This brought about the attempt of General Franco, a republican by and large, and produced our sympathy for his cause."

Within these lines lies the peril into which the people of the United States are being lured today by the baloney of the Popular Front for democracy and peace. One false step and we will be in; a leap out at the eleventh hour would plunge those who escaped into Fascism. Let us be warned in time. The false prophets of peace and democracy are among us. We have to be on our guard and be prepared before it is too late.

The spectacles of suffering women and children in shell-torn Barcelona and in China are being paraded before our eyes in order to drag us into a spurious war for democracy. The innocent victims of the conflict have the sympathy of every right-minded man and woman in the world. But we can-

not blink our eyes to the fact that in Spain the tragedy was deliberately provoked by Red agents, and that in the Far East Red terrorists provided the excuse for Japanese invasion. Everyone in his own walk of life would like to do something towards alleviating the suffering of wars abroad. But the way *not* to do it, is to fall for the baloney of the Popular Front.

The Popular Front Government in France was in office for only a year, but Premier Blum resigned with a budgetary deficit of fifty billion francs. Since his resignation the franc has been soaring skywards. The reign of the Popular Front now costs French democracy an average of fifteen per cent of their previous buying-power. If the Popular Front supporters here and in France would contribute even a tithe of their wages to relieve the suffering caused by their preaching in Spain and in China, they would save money and would also preserve the soul of true democracy.

THROWBACK TO FEUDALISM

HENRY WATTS



IN a brief memoir of Maude Violet Clarke, the late Vice-Principal of Somerville College at Oxford, which prefaces a collection of her essays on fourteenth-century history, there occurs this passage:

She was indeed as modern, as directly a child of her own time as these medieval women were children of their age; but, with all the difference in circumstance, she had this medieval sense of a rule and a law, the belief that one's inner freedom is not diminished but enhanced by submission to the life and service of a community.

In this particular instance, the writer of the memoir had in a previous sentence likened his subject to one of those women who ruled a medieval abbey; a valiant and noble clan that still enlighten the world with their lives. But it seems that, looking around at our civilization today in general, and at American civilization in particular, the thing that really does cut us off from the Middle Ages is the loss of this "medieval sense of a rule and a law."

If the good life is to be measured in terms of sanitation rather than in terms of sanctity, then in our overwhelming superiority in the matter of shower-baths, tooth pastes, rapid transportation and means of communication, the Middle Ages were very medieval indeed, in the most depressing sense wherein that word could be understood. But in the possessing of a sense of a rule and a law, in any belief that our inner freedom is not diminished by submission to the life and service of a community, we are so far behind the Middle Ages, that our generation has fallen into a barbarism that is comparable only to the darkest of the dark ages.

Save only on a point of chronology, there is noth-

ing paradoxical in saying that the Middle Ages were not medieval at all. This term has been grossly abused and overworked; it has been made to signify something unspeakably crude and barbaric. So that outmoded things, like a primitive sewage system, or the infrangibility of the holy bond of matrimony, or the ideal of the consecrated life either in Holy Orders or in Holy Religion, are all pretty much spoken of as something medieval, meaning thereby something utterly barbaric and inconceivably uncivilized. If there is any doubt at all on this point, read the daily papers. Hardly a day passes but that one may see in our periodical press that such a thing is medieval; the obvious meaning being that it is barbaric.

Now there is a certain sense in which it may properly be said that if we have not retained, at least we have seen resuscitated, one side of medievalism; and that, most unhappily, one of its least desirable aspects. This is the modern feudalism which, in whatever forms it is encountered, is infinitely more devastating than were the most unrestrained expressions of feudal banditry. And we find this modern feudalism rearing its ugly head in circumstances where today our generation is least equipped to deal with it, but where the Middle Ages had at hand means to deal with it and most effectively to keep it within its proper bounds. The two spheres in which this modern predatory feudalism has most strongly entrenched itself are the spheres of politics and industry.

In these two spheres one needs not to be particularly alert to discover at once that although the medieval sense of a rule and a law is entirely absent, there is a distinct sense of a rule and a law—the rule and law of the jungle. If there is lacking the medieval belief that one's inner freedom is not diminished but enhanced by submission to the life and service of a community, there is certainly a dictatorial belief that the freedom of the individual must be submitted to the service of the totalitarian state. It makes very little difference whether the feudatory force be the Communistic coercion of Mr. Joseph Stalin or of Mr. Adolf Hitler. The point is that both these ideologies of compulsion, so far from being a modern advancement on medieval social conditions, are a throwback to one of the most barbarous states of society that existed in the dark ages.

In such conditions of life, mankind seems to be infinitely worse off than any population in the Middle Ages could ever have conceived itself to be. There existed a oneness and unity in Christendom in those days, which has now disappeared and can, for all that we may discern, never again appear. And exactly because there was this oneness and unity, it was not only possible but easy for a single man to lift up his voice and speak as the mouthpiece of this united Christendom. That mouthpiece was the Pope, who could speak not only as the Supreme Teacher of the Universal Church, but as the representative voice of all men and of each man in all Christendom.

It was with such a voice that Pope Urban II spoke at Clermont, when he called upon the chiv-

alry of Christendom to rescue the Holy Places of Palestine from the infidel. What is the position today? The position is that a great part of civilization has fallen into the toils of a predatory feudalism. Where is there now any chivalry of Christendom to cry out *Dieux le veult* if it were called upon by Pius XI to rescue the holy places of Moscow from the infidel? Let us be honest with ourselves: that chivalry would be most demonstratively dumb!

It is worthwhile to repeat that we have lost the medieval sense of a rule and a law. The law has become the law of the jungle; the rule is now the face-saving rule of expediency. The watchmen upon the watchtowers of our modern political Zion are engaged in the ancient and dishonorable watching of which way the cat will jump. It would seem as if the despised Middle Ages had us beat at every turn. François Mauriac has something to say about these days and times in his definition of a true Christian:

In a society where nothing matters but for the masses, the Catholic is the only one for whom it is impossible to conform with the masses, because Christ has made him a person that no power on earth can disintegrate.

For him there is no place in a totalitarian State where the collective conscience is substituted for the individual conscience.

And what we can see in the sphere of government, we can see equally in the sphere of commerce and industry. There was a Christian moral sense underlying the whole economic structure of medieval Christendom; a moral sense that curbed monopolies, regulated competition, fixed the just price, restrained usury, and provided a social security which, so far as modern state paternalism has shown, has not been improved upon by any scheme of state social security.

The chaos which today envelops the entire civilized world, whether in government, in politics, in economics, in philosophy, can be traced immediately and directly to this one fact—that we have allowed to be lost or thrown away our inheritance from the Middle Ages. The medieval sense of a rule and a law has become entirely forgotten. The conception of a rule prevails, and it is that there is no rule; of a law, that there is no law.

It is not without reason that we are entered upon a condition of spiritual anarchy, and this is something immeasurably different from a condition of spiritual revolt. For the anarchy is against the law. But the spiritual revolt is against capricious tyranny, against lawlessness. The revolt is the supreme expression of the conviction that there is not only a rule, but a law also.

The evidence for our condition is obvious; it is clear where we are fallen down. Whatever is left of freedom or blessing—in religion, in art, in political and community life, in the law and the learned professions—in all these things there is nothing that has endured, but was slowly, certainly, and often painfully, hammered out in the process of subjection to a law and a rule. Out of chaos and anarchy submission to community life and service brought order; it brought order and civilization, which is Christendom.

WITCH HUNT IN CENTER STREET

The veterans lose all the battles but win the war

GERARD DONNELLY, S.J.

IS there any way of throwing a Communist out of the public office to which he has been appointed?

The question has agitated New York City since last December—no mere hypothetical question, if you please, but one that has roused the citizenry and brought it to furious bellowing, picket lines and various forms of political eye-gouging—all accompanied by loud cries from either camp of liar, traitor, moss-back, witch-hunter, Fascist, and even nincompoop. Moreover, the question is one which, if not answered soon in New York, will probably rise to plague other parts of the country as well.

Suppose that you cling passionately to democracy, free speech, the Constitution, tolerance and all the rest. But suppose that you also happen to believe that Communists are dedicated to the destruction of government, and therefore should not be allowed to occupy a berth in your local administration where they can play Trojan Horse, Borer-from-Within, and the role of Seyss-Inquart all in one. And suppose your community, holding the same views, goes to the polls on election day, defeats all Communist candidates, and confers the crown on a politico who ran on a platform of loathing for Marx, Moscow and the devil. Then, immediately afterwards, suppose your newly elected politico betrays you by appointing a hardworking and zealous Red to a responsible post in his government. What then? Is your city to remain helpless? Is it to content itself merely with swearing?

All this leads us to a look at the Gerson case. The scene is Manhattan, which is one borough in the vast quintuplet city of New York. And the lesson to be learned from it all is probably this: You can get rid of your Communist only if you can prove before a court that he has personally preached the violent overthrow of government. If you cannot prove that, then all your shoutings, your mass meetings, your angry pointings to the Manifesto, and your political devices are useless. Unless—and this is important—you also aim them as threats against your elected politico and frighten him into rescinding his appointment.

Two days before Christmas, Stanley M. Isaacs confirmed a rumor. Mr. Isaacs, voted in as Borough President of Manhattan a few weeks previously, faced a group of curious reporters and admitted—

indeed he was happy to announce at this time—that he had appointed Simon W. Gerson to his staff as confidential inspector. And would the press be careful to add that he had chosen Mr. Gerson solely for ability? And that he considered Mr. Gerson's political convictions, whatever they might be, no more of a bar to his efficiency than his race or religion or his opinion about the fifth at Hialeah?

The press found this news worth space on the front page, for it knew Mr. Gerson as a Communist and an avowed one. Digging into their files, the reporters soon brought out some further facts. Mr. Gerson joined the Party in 1931. Two years later he went to work as political reporter for the *Daily Worker*, the Stalinist organ. In 1936 he ran for office on the Communist ticket, polling 62,000 votes. The press could not be certain, but it suspected that he was an official in the party, and it later persuaded him to a statement in which he said that he did not intend to resign either from the party or from his new city job. This was of major interest, for Mr. Gerson would be the first avowed Communist ever to hold substantial office in New York.

Of much greater interest, however, was the game of political pussy-wants-a-corner that the man and his favorite borough president began to play a few days later. In an effort to avoid various pitfalls of the law, Mr. Gerson was named by his patron to no fewer than four successive jobs during January and took at least three distinct oaths of office. The reasons for this series of changes, which somewhat resembled Bill Robinson's famous tap dance up and down the staircase, are a bit too complicated to explain here, but in quick succession Mr. Gerson was announced as (1) confidential inspector, (2) examiner, (3) assistant, (4) examiner.

As soon as the news of his third job was given out, the pot of popular resentment, which had been bubbling angrily for some weeks, suddenly boiled over and created a fearsome public stink. The thought of any Communist in administrative position, to say nothing of seeing him promoted to top-flight rank, drove the patriotic and the Catholic groups particularly into a frenzy. Protests, all of them wrathful and many profane, began to be heard. The American Legion frothed at the mouth. There were picket lines and threats of retribution.

The Legion furnished a note of humor by naming Legionnaire LaGuardia to act as a committee of one in appealing to the Governor. And all this was met from the other side by the usual letter signed by leading ministers and professors, angry speeches about democracy, *Vox Pop* essays on tolerance, and a prolonged clamor from the professional liberals.

The excitement came to a climax when a minor mob representing both camps swarmed into a small chamber to boo, hiss, or applaud the witnesses in a hearing held by the civil-service commission.

When this hearing came to naught, the veterans consolidated and laid out a scheme of strategy. It is interesting to see how their plans failed.

Their first thought, for instance, was to indict Mr. Gerson and to hale him to court. There is a State law which defines a subversive group as "one organized for the overthrow of government by force," and then goes on to declare membership in it a felony. Surely, the veterans argued, Mr. Gerson runs afoul this law since he admits his Communism.

But the lawyers derided the argument. That statute has been on the books for years, they pointed out; yet the courts have never applied it to the Communist party. Nor has the Legislature ever outlawed the party. It is still legal; it has a right to a ticket, candidates, a press, voters and meetings. And if the party is not held subversive, no crime attaches to membership. Besides, the lawyers went on, what do the courts understand by membership in a subversive group? Merely putting one's name on its roster? Surely not that, but only a man's personal advocacy of the revolutionary doctrines. But could anyone show where Mr. Gerson had ever preached violence? The answer was no. But until such evidence was found, argued the lawyers, no court would find the man guilty and vacate his job.

And so the lawyers, surrendering all idea of a frontal assault, prepared an attack from the flank. Instituting a taxpayers' suit, they argued that Gerson's promotion was illegal because another man (a Mr. Goodkind) had previously been sworn into the office of assistant. The city's laws provided for only one incumbent in this post; hence Gerson had been raised to a non-existent office. There were additional points involved and the case looked fool-proof. But a few hours before the court hearing Mr. Gerson dodged the whole difficulty. Making a hasty visit to his benefactor, he resigned his title and was sworn in anew to a fourth job as inspector. Whereat the veterans' case collapsed.

Then the veterans formed a delegation and went to Albany for a visit to Governor Lehman. This time they aimed their fire at the Borough President as well as at his quick-change appointee. The president should be kicked out of office, insisted the veterans in a twelve-page typewritten petition. Mr. Isaacs had violated his sacred oath of office. Why? Because, although sworn to uphold the government, he had given responsible position in the city service to a man committed by political philosophy to violent revolution. Mr. Isaacs had also betrayed the public trust. Why? Because the very ballots cast for Mr. Isaacs showed that the people wanted no Gersons in office. To appoint a man who would

have been steam-rolled at the polls was to outrage the public will.

This seemed a powerful plea. But one day later the Governor gave answer. Had there been question of mis- mal- or non-feasance by an elected official, the Governor could act. But here there was question only of Mr. Isaacs' discretion. The law (said the Governor) confers wide discretion on elected officers, especially in the matter of their appointments to office. No Executive should interfere with that discretion. Hence, the Governor would not act in the case.

Profoundly disappointed, the legionnaires next turned to the Legislature. As a result of their pressure a bill was introduced prohibiting the appointment to public office of any person "who becomes a member of any organization formed to teach or advocate the propriety of the doctrine of criminal anarchy or Communism." The bill defined both things in the usual way. Earl Browder, the Party's secretary immediately protested. The American Communist Party, he asserted, does not advocate force or violence. Other groups filed objections.

But a few days later, in the last hours of its session, the Legislature passed the bill by an overwhelming vote—with its defenders berating Mr. Isaacs, and its opponents shouting hoarsely about human rights, insidious legislation, the shadow of Nazism and fundamental principles.

And to be sure the new legislation hardly promises to solve the Gerson puzzle. For one thing, the Governor will probably veto the Act or the courts hold it unconstitutional. For the bill does not appear to outlaw explicitly the Party itself, and its members may still meet, draw up tickets, vote, and campaign for public jobs. How then can any one of them be deprived of civil rights—be barred from appointive office merely on the score that he belongs to an organization that is still lawful? And if he can be barred, why not Catholics, union plumbers, Equity actors, or plain Democrats—all members of equally legal organizations? Moreover, the bill applies only to future appointments, is not retroactive, and so will not oust Gerson; whereas known Communists who seek appointment in future have only to disavow their party membership (even if the party were outlawed) or their personal belief in violent revolution, and then cheerfully take both their job and their oath of office.

And so the moral of the Gerson case seems to be that democratic methods are best. Let the reader waste no pity on the veterans, for though they have apparently lost all their battles, they have won the war. The tremendous popular feeling they have stirred up against the Borough President has brought that official only gloom and forebodings. He winces at every thought of the public ire. He foresees a crushing defeat next time at the polls. And perhaps long before the Gerson affair becomes an issue in the next campaign he will try to win back public good will by ousting his appointee.

But whether or not Mr. Gerson is forced out, it is a pretty safe wager that for the next few years at least no other known Communist will be shoved into public office in New York.

WITH SCRIP AND STAFF

ANSWER TO ANTI-FASCISM

FOR those who feel alarm over the advance of certain un-Christian doctrines roughly labeled "Fascist," the most disquieting feature is that the so-called anti-Fascist movement has become so thoroughly discredited among intelligent men. It reveals itself day to day as a mere bid for power and influence on the part of revolutionary schemers, who have no intelligible explanation of where they are going or how they reconcile their professed horror of "Fascism" with their palliation of every conceivable form of violence, deceit and governmental tyranny.

The drift of thought among those whose eyes have become opened to the depths of much anti-Fascist humbug is indicated in contributions to another of the small quarterlies that spring up with each turn of the year: *The Examiner*, edited by Geoffrey Stone, and published in Rye, N. Y. "Looking out upon the world today," says Dr. Meyrick Booth, an English contributor, "we see it divided by a great fissure. On the one side stand the British, French, Russians and Americans, owning between them no less than 30,000,000 square miles of land; on the other are the hungry-eyed ranks of the Japanese, Italians, Germans, Austrians and Hungarians, who possess, all together, less than 1,000,000 square miles." And he finds it a decided anomaly, which makes the solution of the problem immeasurably more difficult, that "the Socialists and their Communist friends should be found so uncompromisingly on the side of the landowners against (as Mussolini so justly describes them) 'the proletarian nations.'"

The mechanics of Communism is a clever utilization of grievance and discontent, for an ulterior purpose which in reality has no substantial connection with the actual merits of the case. The tragedy, from the standpoint of any clarification of minds, lies therein that the real issues are lost in the actions and reactions that result from agitation.

While I congratulate the *Examiner* as a sign of a real awakening of thought that cannot be howled down by a mere cry of reactionary, I regret that Mr. Stone merely walks out of "anti-Fascism's" trap to tumble into the trap of Fascism. While not advocating Fascism as wholly suited for America, he urges its sympathetic consideration on the ground that "Fascism alone of present movements attempts a radical break with the forces that have produced our present dilemma."

This statement, as it stands, is definitely untrue. The "radical break" with the forces that have produced our present dilemma lies in that concept of society which is based not upon a national or a racial myth but upon the Christian teaching concerning the origin, dignity and destiny of the hu-

man person. Such a concept of society can rightfully claim the name of Christian Democracy, as is clear to one who reads the Encyclical on Christian Democracy of Pope Leo XIII (*Graves de Communi*, 1901). Using the term "democracy" of the form of society, not of the type of government, a Christian Democracy may be defined as a society in which the God-given dignity and destiny of the human person is fully recognized, in laws, government, institutions and human conduct. The apologists of Fascism oppose mere "individualism" to Fascism. Fascism, says Mr. Stone, is a "return to the organic state, whose foundation and analogy is in the family." But the logical remedy for individualism—social and political atomization, social and political irresponsibility—is to be found not in a state "positively" established by force of arms or force of myth or any other manifestation of mere naturalism. The remedy for individualism, and the true basis of the family as the unit of society and of society as an organized body, lies in the Christian concept of the human person, endowed with a natural dignity by its Creator and with a supernatural grandeur through its fellowship with Jesus Christ.

The family, moreover, is not the foundation of the state, nor the state of the family. The family is the foundation of society, which is a distinct entity from the state, society's agent for the common good. Even though Fascism arose as a protest against Socialism and Socialists, it inherited from Socialism the inability to distinguish society from the state. Only in the Christian concept is this fatal confusion avoided.

Just as the propagandist "anti-Fascism" raises unreal issues, so the attack on the democratic concept of society can befog the mind. Exposure of the ghastly evils of individualism need not obscure the fact that individualism, in the objectionable sense in which it is rightly used by Mr. Stone and his associates, is irreconcilable with the concept of a Christian Democracy. The real point at issue was put with homely clearness by Cardinal Villeneuve, Archbishop of Quebec, in a memorable address on *Liberty and Liberties* which he delivered before the University Club of Montreal on January 29 of this year. His Eminence quoted the splendid description of a Christian Democracy uttered by Msgr. Bilczewski, one of modern Poland's most patriotic bishops, and closed by saying that not mere good-fellowship (*bon garçonnisme*) would "reconstruct healthy democracies, but clear doctrines as well as strong virtues. It is these which rest upon true liberty, and which are also the foundation of great and lasting liberties."

Not from states or governments, however ingenious or effective, but from the rehabilitation of the human person will the work of reconstruction begin.

JOHN LAFARGE

COMMUNIST OATHS

THE case of Simon Gerson, of New York, is of more than topical interest. The President of the Borough of Manhattan recently chose Mr. Gerson as his assistant, at which the cry went up that Mr. Gerson was, if not legally ineligible, at least unfit for public office in this country, since he is an avowed Communist.

Mr. Gerson has countered rather lamely with fervent affirmations of his loyalty to the Constitution and to all that is typically American. His superior, Mr. Isaacs, has seconded these protestations, but has also added that he does not know much about Communism as it exists in New York. Since that statement was uttered, the American Legion and other associations have been endeavoring, apparently without success, to dispel his ignorance.

It appears that as recently as October 29, 1937, in a signed article published in a Communist newspaper, Mr. Gerson urged his fellow-Communists to enlist as many as possible in the party "to build up a powerful People's Front in America." The significance of these phrases is unmistakable. Two weeks later, at a mass meeting of some 20,000 persons in Madison Square Garden, 3,000 recruits were enrolled in the Communist party, after asserting their loyalty to "the party of Lenin," and their "complete devotion to the Leninist struggle for a Soviet America." Possibly it was this meeting that led Mr. Isaacs to conclude that Mr. Gerson was a fit person to hold responsible office as his associate; at any rate the appointment was announced within a few weeks.

Now it is Mr. Gerson's legal right to join the Communist party, an aggregation recognized hitherto by the State of New York. But it is impossible to understand how Mr. Gerson, a member of a party, professing allegiance to the party of Lenin, and active approval of Lenin's attempts to establish himself in this country, can take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of New York. The principles of these American documents and of the Soviet Government are absolutely incompatible. No man can be loyal to this country and to Moscow.

It is also difficult to understand how, granting that the Madison Square Garden meeting conducted under official auspices, represents the purposes of the Communist party, the State of New York can henceforth recognize the Communists as a legitimate political party. If today a man can assert his allegiance to Lenin and tomorrow take the oath of allegiance required from holders of public office, affirming their devotion to the Constitution, then we have no protection against the Communist strategy of boring from within.

We trust that the legislatures of States in which Communists present themselves as candidates, will give this intolerable condition serious study. The Communists are legally entitled to their opinions and to the expression of them. But they should not be permitted to take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution, after pledging allegiance to Lenin.

WEATHER VANES

THE Secretary of State is "horrified" at the bombing of Barcelona, which is none of his official business, and "gravely concerned" over the confiscation of oil-properties in Mexico, which is his business, his long-neglected business. What weather vanes our public officials are! There have been a number of bombings, even within the last few months, which have in no wise ruffled the Secretary; all depends, it would seem, upon the author of the bombing. As for Mexico, what else could this Government of ours look for? Who sups with the devil, must not complain of burns.

NEUTRALITY AND

AS he peruses the Congressional debates on neutrality and embargo legislation, the average citizen finds himself puzzled. It would appear that decided differences of opinion exist as to the meaning of neutrality, and even greater differences as to the articles which an embargo should embrace. He is apt to take refuge from these puzzles in his belief that we ought to keep peace with all nations, and refuse to sell anything to any nation engaged in war, even if selling does improve business.

That, of course, is an expression of wholesome opinion. But it is not a solution. It is possible for a people who earnestly desire peace to see themselves swept into war. Twenty-four years ago, we were divided on local political issues, but on the proposition that the war in Europe was none of our business, there was moral unity. Since we had no interest at stake there was no reason why we should take part in it. Yet the very President who was elected in 1916, largely because his followers presented him on the platform, "he kept us out of war," with the implied promise that he would continue to keep us out of war, appeared before Congress in April, 1917, to urge Congress to declare that a state of war existed between the German Empire and this nation. Thereat the drums beat, the flags waved, and our young men flocked to the training camps.

Looking back over the years, we can now see that given the hidden factors, allowed to operate without serious check by the Government, war was inevitable. It was not inevitable in the

CIVIL SERVICE

THAT "civil service develops inefficiency, protects incompetence and promotes extravagance" is the sentiment recently attributed to a prominent Democratic leader. The sentiment is not openly admitted by the Administration, but Democratic Congressmen with a few exceptions, such as Senator Walsh, vote according to it. They believe that we shall never have effective, competent and economical public service until officials, who have qualified by study and by open competitive examination, have been replaced by wool-hatted wardheelers. As taxes go up, public service goes down.

ITY AND EMBARGO

sense that we had a more actual cause in 1917 than we had in 1914, but that the force exercised by misled molders of public opinion, combined with power exercised by corporations and individuals who feared property losses, created conditions under which the people allowed themselves to be swept into war. Almost from the beginning we carried on a large trade with the belligerents, chiefly the Allies, a trade that apparently stimulated business and made us prosperous. In addition, foreign nations were freely allowed to float loans in this country, and their agents were well-known figures in all American banking centers. In the end we went to war, not to save democracy, and not in defense of the rights of small nations, but to save our investments, and in defense of what were conceived to be property rights.

After all, then, while the common man cannot express himself in legal or in diplomatic language, he is right in his belief that if we wish to keep ourselves from the entanglements of war we must first keep ourselves from entanglements created by commerce and business with nations engaged in war. There is such a thing as a sane and wholesome isolation of nation from nation. That isolation will not be created by an embargo on the sale of arms. Today anything that can be used to strengthen an army or navy to continue fighting falls under the head of munitions. Cannon are munitions, so too are food and clothing, and the direct or indirect extension of credit. Safety can be found only in isolation.

FEDERAL SCHOOL FUNDS

PROBABLY the groups which have approved the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Education have their lunatic fringes. But looking at the recommendations with neither a hostile nor a friendly but with an appraising eye, some of the recommendations may be styled at least slightly abnormal.

There is the anathema, for instance, which the recommendations hurl against Federal control of the local schools. We do not question the sincerity of those who launch these anathemas. We merely ask how they propose to enforce them. Federal bureaus have never been known to reject with indignation new grants of power; on the contrary, as experience has shown, they continually seek to expand the field of their authority. At a meeting held in New York last week, Dr. Floyd Reeves, chairman of the Committee, frankly admitted that complete control of the funds to be allotted for school buildings would be retained by the Federal Government. What the local communities desire will, doubtless, be given consideration, but final decision as to the type of building and the locality will be made by Washington.

In response to a question put at this meeting, Dr. Reeves, unwittingly, no doubt, conceded a further degree of control to Congress. Asked how the Government would prevent political influence in those States in which the State educational authorities are chosen on a political basis by popular vote, Dr. Reeves answered that the recommendations had discovered a way of obliterating the politicians. The Federal Government would graciously permit these recreant States to continue to elect their chief educational authorities, but it would demand that they make all appointments "for merit alone."

Dr. Reeves surely lacks a sense of humor if he thinks that the Federal Government, which in the last five years has all but destroyed the civil-service system begun some fifty years ago, will really insist that appointments be made for "merit alone." Granting a new Federal Government with new ideals, the local politicians will not lose their cunning. It is not difficult to devise a system which is all merit outwardly and all loot within. But in any case, should the Federal Government insist upon a merit system, it is clear that here the Federal Government invades a State right, and supports its invasion by promises of Federal money.

How many years will pass before the political pedagogs at Washington completely control the schools in the States, once the subsidy system is installed? We think, rather, that the term will be measured in months. Washington has not "cooperated" with the States these five years. Cooperation belongs to the horse-and-buggy-age. Washington does not cooperate. It controls.

Equally unsatisfactory was Dr. Reeves' answer to a question referring to the use of Federal funds for non-public schools. While he made his personal opposition to such aid fairly clear, he admitted that in at least five States public funds were being used

to provide transportation to children in non-public schools, and to furnish them with text-books. In all the other States, legal or constitutional provisions outlaw the use of public funds for these purposes. Dr. Reeves protested that the Federal Government should not forbid the States to maintain these provisions.

Plainly Dr. Reeves here fails to distinguish between the use of State funds for the schools, and the use of Federal funds for the same purpose.

His theory that a ban properly exists in forty-three States can hardly be maintained, we think, after the decision of the Supreme Court in the Louisiana text-book case. But apart from this, nothing in the Federal Constitution bars the use of Federal funds to aid schools not conducted by the several States. In using the monies to be appropriated under the plan advised by the Committee, the States will act merely as agents of the Federal Government which is fully entitled to nominate the recipients of these funds.

Granting, then, that a State may not use its public funds except for the public schools, it does not follow that the Federal Government labors under the same disability. On the contrary, the right of Congress to make grants in aid of non-public as well as of public schools seems beyond question.

Whether the non-public schools desire these grants, is quite another matter. We are entitled to speak for none of them, but as far as our observation goes, they seem divided in opinion, with probably a majority against the initiation of a Federal subsidy system. But as to their right to participate in Federal funds, despite State inhibitions and also despite Dr. Reeves's opinion, we believe they are united.

"CONTUMACY"

IF we are not in error, the President on fourteen different occasions asked Chairman Morgan, of the TVA, to disclose his evidence. On every occasion, Dr. Morgan declined, for reasons which to us appear to be justified. On March 22, the President removed Dr. Morgan, and appointed Director H. A. Morgan in his place.

We now sorely need a thorough and impartial investigation by a joint Congressional committee, from which Senator Barkley is excluded. The head of this committee should be a skilled investigator, not a Senator who has publicly stated that the whole affair is a tempest in a teapot. With an Administration Senator as chairman, the final report might as well be written before the hearings begin.

Incidentally, just what is meant by the President's claim that Dr. Morgan exposed himself to the guilt of "contumacy"? One can be guilty of contempt of court, and Congressional committees have the power of committing recalcitrant witnesses for contempt. Does the President share this power? If he judges an individual guilty of "contumacy" may he punish by fine, imprisonment, removal from office and other penalties? The question would seem important enough to submit to the courts.

PASSION WEEK

TOMORROW the Church begins to commemorate the more solemn parts of the holy season of Lent. She veils the crucifix upon the altar and makes certain changes in the liturgy. From the Mass, the Psalm *Judica* and the *Gloria Patri* are omitted, and the Preface of the Holy Cross is read daily. The Gospels are those which refer to the plotting of the Jews against Our Lord, and the last days before the Crucifixion.

Fittingly, then, does the Church preface this season with a Gospel (Saint John, viii, 46-59) in which Our Lord plainly asserts and establishes His Divinity. Jesus is surrounded in the court of the Temple by "multitudes of the Jews." They have come to Our Lord not as followers, nor even as open-minded inquirers willing to hear and to meditate upon His teaching, but as hostile critics. They charge Him with being a Samaritan, using the term in an insulting sense, and even assert that He is possessed by the devil. Reading the Gospel carefully we see that the words which fell from the lips of Our Saviour are among the most beautiful uttered by Him, but the end of it all was that the Jews "took up stones . . . to cast at Him." Our Lord could do nothing for them, not that the power of Divine grace has limits, but simply because they would not listen to Him. "He that is of God heareth the word of God," said Our Divine Saviour. "Therefore you hear them not, because you are not of God."

Often in these simple reflections, we must have noticed how strikingly similar is the treatment meted out to Our Lord by the Jews to the treatment meted out for ages to the Church, Christ's Mystical Body, by the world. The world often affects to be unaware of the Church and of her influence, but from time to time it will assume another attitude. In a spirit of large liberality, professed for the occasion, it will examine her doctrines and their effect upon mankind, and then turn away unchanged in its opinions, as did so many of those who heard Our Lord when He preached in the villages of Judea. The seed of the Word has fallen along the roadside or on stony ground. At other times, the world's attitude is fiercely denunciatory. It indicts the Church, and then acts as judge, jury and executioner. When the Church defends her mission, as in tomorrow's Gospel Our Lord is shown defending His Divinity, it takes up stones and strives to kill her.

Naturally our hearts are filled with sadness when persecution comes, both because of the sufferings our brethren must undergo and because of the scandal given to weak souls. But we must always remember that even as His persecutors could not keep Our Lord from His glorious Resurrection, so the most bitter attacks by the world cannot destroy the Divine mission of the Church. Our Lord was never more powerful than when He was nailed to the Cross, for in that moment He broke the power of Hell. In like manner the Church, continually repeating the Passion of Our Lord, is never conquered. She always rises in triumph from the tomb in which the world believes it has sealed her.

CHRONICLE

THE CONGRESS. Following his charges of dishonesty and want of integrity against two fellow directors, TVA Chairman, Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, was removed from the Board by President Roosevelt, because Dr. Morgan refused to submit his evidence to the President's investigation. Dr. Morgan insisted on a Congressional inquiry. The right of the President to remove the TVA chairman will be challenged, it was believed. Demand for a Congressional investigation spread through both houses. Asserting that "Directors David E. Lilienthal and H. A. Morgan now are in possession of all the records of the TVA," Senator Bridges declared: "Unless there is an immediate investigation of the things to which Dr. Morgan referred, these may be covered up or white-washed." . . . Letters from radicals poured into Congress urging bills that would permit shipment of arms to the Spanish Communists. . . . The Administration's \$1,121,546,000 Naval Bill was passed by the House, 292 to 100. Three battleships, two aircraft carriers, nine cruisers, twenty-three destroyers, nine submarines, twenty-two auxiliary ships were authorized by the measure. A 3,000-naval-airplane minimum was set. A \$3,000,000 dirigible was authorized. . . . The House refused appropriations for Gilbertsville Dam, large project of the TVA. . . . Twenty amendments to the Reorganization Bill, all seeking to limit President Roosevelt's authority under the Bill, were defeated in the Senate.

- - -

THE ADMINISTRATION. No isolation; collaboration, parallel action with other nations; protection of American interests everywhere: these and other points were included as Secretary Hull outlined American foreign policy in a world broadcast. The Secretary condemned the Ludlow war referendum which would allow the American people to decide whether they wanted to enter a foreign war. Nations which stand for international order must not abandon the Pacific, he said. . . . In a statement regarded as unusual since no American interests are at stake, Secretary Hull voiced a "sense of horror" over what has taken place at Barcelona. The statement was viewed as especially significant inasmuch as the Secretary issued no such pronouncement when Nationalist cities in Spain were bombed by the Communists. . . . The United States presented to the Japanese Government a claim of \$2,214,007.36 for damages sustained in the attack on the U. S. gunboat *Panay* and three American tankers. No punitive damages were included. . . . Speaking at Gainesville, Ga., at the dedication of Roosevelt Square, the President assailed the South's low wages. He claimed national prosperity was retarded by a selfish few. . . . While Cárdenas in Mexico expropriated American oil properties without com-

pensation, the Washington Government uttered no protest, did not discontinue its monthly purchases of Mexican silver at artificially high prices, a great financial support for the Mexican Government. . . . The Washington ambassador of the Spanish Communists sought to obtain a direct flow of munitions from the United States to the Spanish Reds. Raymond Leslie Buell, of the Foreign Policy Association, New York urged that the embargo against Spain under the Neutrality Act be revoked. Secretary Hull indicated the embargo would not be lifted.

- - -

AT HOME. Stocks dropped to new lows, wiping out the gains built up during three years. . . . Governor Lehman in a letter to the Senate Finance Committee warned that Federal tax policies are threatening the sovereignty of the States. . . . Earle Browder, general secretary of the Communist party in the United States, declared there were treasonable forces working against the Roosevelt Administration. "If Jefferson had his Burr, let us not forget that Roosevelt has his Garner," the Communist leader said. . . . Cardinal Hayes in a statement said he was "praying that General Franco will win because the Spanish Loyalist Government is controlled by Communists and other radicals." Anti-Catholic bigotry influences many Americans to take sides against the Nationalists, the Cardinal thought. . . . Cardinal O'Connell declared the Spanish Government is "no government at all, but only an unruly mob of atheists and Communists." "Franco is fighting for Christian civilization in Spain," the Cardinal said. Cardinal O'Connell criticized the American press for its Loyalist bias. "I cannot understand the attitude of the American press," he said. The Cardinal warned that Bolshevism is "burrowing in" in the United States.

- - -

SPAIN. A series of air-raids on Barcelona resulted in the death of about 1,200 civilians. The objectives of the raiders were said to be munition factories, military storehouses and army concentration areas. . . . Nationalist headquarters announced that no foreign volunteers had entered Nationalist Spain for more than a year. . . . When the Franco brigades captured Caspe, they found all but two of the city's priests had been murdered by the Loyalists. These two had been in hiding for twenty months. The Reds burned the city's churches. They carried a figure of Christ to the main square of Caspe, cut it to pieces there. 3,000 Red fighters, foreigners belonging to the International Brigades, were reported killed in the Aragon battles. . . . Shifting the emphasis from central to upper Aragon, Franco

columns began an offensive in the Huesca sector. Nationalist soldiers crossed the Ebro River, twenty-five miles southeast of Saragossa, advanced five miles on the road to Barcelona. The Red armies which have besieged Huesca since the beginning of the civil war were driven off. . . . Editorials from the *New York Times*, on the Barcelona bombings and on the United States Neutrality law were widely reprinted in the Loyalist press. . . . Generalissimo Franco declared: "Not an inch of Spanish territory will be ceded by us to any foreign power." Foreign troops with his armies constituted only five per cent of his total effectives, the Generalissimo said. . . . The *Osservatore Romano*, semi-official Vatican paper, revealed that Pope Pius in February, on his own initiative, made representations to General Franco against the aerial bombardment of open towns. The General replied with "filial and reassuring explanations and declarations," the *Osservatore* said. The Pontiff once more made representations, on his own initiative, in the Barcelona bombings. The paper adds that while the Church was engaged in charitable work in Spain, the Loyalists on January 6 last murdered twenty-seven of the sixty-five priests in Teruel.

— — —

POLAND-LITHUANIA. The World War treaty which established Lithuania and Poland as independent nations selected for the capital of Lithuania the city of Vilna. Lithuania was once a part of Poland and Vilna was the birthplace of the Polish national hero Marshal Pilsudski. In 1920, the Polish free lance General Zelogowski seized Vilna. Poland has never recognized the independence of Lithuania; Lithuania still calls Vilna her capital. Diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken in 1920; have never since been resumed. Poland has several times sought to reach an agreement with Lithuania without success. . . . Into this situation came a border incident involving the death of a Polish soldier. From Poland to Lithuania went an ultimatum demanding, chiefly, resumption of the long-ruptured diplomatic relations. Polish troops massed; Lithuania capitulated, announced normal diplomatic relations would be resumed with Poland.

— — —

JAPAN-CHINA. The Chinese Communist Eighth Route Army attacked Japanese forces along the Peiping-Hankow Railway between Peiping and Shihkiachwang. . . . While Japanese were driving Chinese from Huchow, eighty miles west of Shanghai, Chinese forces reported successes in Shansi Province. . . . From Wuhu, above Nanking, Japanese penetrated further up the Yangtze River. . . . A huge Nipponese army battled its way toward Suchow. Fierce Chinese counter attacks brought them to a stop nineteen miles north of Suchow. . . . All over the enormous North China war area Chinese Communist armies and guerrillas were cutting Japanese communication lines. . . . Chinese Communists who give their troops "three hours' instruction on Leninism daily," set up Communist regimes in Hopeh Province. . . .

GERMANY. Nazification of Austria went on rapidly. Official total of political arrests was 1,742. . . . The Vatican's Concordat with the former Vienna Government came to an end. . . . Msgr. Witz, Archbishop of Salzburg, was searched on suspicion he had documents proving his connections with Communists. Five Salzburg priests were arrested. One of them was slapped in the face. Catholic organizations in Salzburg and Linz were dissolved. The Catholic press of Austria was taken over by the Nazis. The office of Msgr. Pawlikowski, Bishop of Graz, was invaded; his books and documents carried off. The Bishop himself was led to jail; later released. . . . In the last meeting of the present Reichstag, Fuehrer Hitler in Berlin received a tempestuous ovation as he explained his action in Austria. Members of the new State Government of Austria sat with the officials of the Berlin regime. Hitler expressed his appreciation of Mussolini's neutrality, saying he would never forget Il Duce's loyal attitude. Hitler announced a plebiscite for the Germans on the same day, April 10, on which the Austrian plebiscite will occur. He dissolved the last Reichstag of the old German Reich, ordered election of a new Reichstag for the greater Germany. He asked the German people to give him four more years. . . . A Protestant pastor, speaking in Rev. Martin Niemoller's Dahlem pulpit, said: "Who knows . . . whether God's bitter laughter is not already reverberating through the heavens? Who knows, whether despite all apparent successes, the nation's breakdown from within has not already begun?" . . . Fuehrer Hitler ordered the German Naval Chief of Staff to build a German war fleet for the Danube River.

— — —

FOOTNOTES. In France, Rightist deputies asked Defense Minister Daladier whether French armaments were going into Spain. Daladier would not answer. . . . In London, United States Ambassador Kennedy told the British that the American people would not commit themselves in advance as to neutrality or participation in a general war. The British Government refused to promise aid to Czechoslovakia or any country east of the Rhine in case of aggression. . . . Anglo-Italian conversations continued. . . . Soviet Russia invited the world's great Powers, excluding Germany, Japan and Italy, to a proposed conference to deal with the threats to world peace. The Russian move was described as "splashing in troubled waters," an attempt to further increase world unrest. . . . Authorized by the Mexican Government, 18,000 oil workers seized control of seventeen United States and British petroleum companies, valued at \$450,000,000. The companies had agreed to pay extra wages, but said they could not allow labor a share in the management if they were to pay so much more in wages. The Mexican Communist party wired President Cárdenas: "The expropriation of the imperialist oil companies is the most brilliant step in the Mexican revolution." Ambassador Daniels revealed the United States Government had been caught napping.

CORRESPONDENCE

TEMPLE OF RELIGION

EDITOR: As a member of the New York World's Fair staff and Secretary and Executive Director of Temple of Religion, Inc., may I be permitted the courtesy of your columns to reply to a *Comment* (March 19), concerning the New York World's Fair for 1939 and the Temple of Religion?

Plans for the Temple were evolved after months of study and consultation with religious leaders and in particular, from the Catholic standpoint, with the Rt. Rev. Thomas E. Molloy, Bishop of Brooklyn, in whose diocese the Fair ground is located, and Patrick Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop of New York.

What are these plans ideologically? I quote from the Board's formal statement: "On this 150th Anniversary of our Constitution, it is desirable to provide some expression not only of the value we place on the spiritual in our lives but of our devotion to those principles of religious freedom which the Constitution embodies. In the present disturbed state of the world, when religion is so seriously menaced, no greater service can be rendered than to magnify these principles in order to preserve them. The Temple of Religion at the New York World's Fair . . . will be at once a concrete embodiment of the value of the principle of freedom of worship and the recognition by each individual of the respect due another's convictions of conscience. . . ."

"The program for the Temple of Religion during the Fair, will be designed to give positive expression in vital form of the value of the spiritual to man; and to exert the most active influence possible for the perpetuation of those principles which all American religious people hold dear. . . . From the Temple a series of great programs will send a message to peoples of the present and the future. These programs, it is hoped will be of the highest spiritual nature and of the deepest influence.

"Convocations and meetings other than denominational services, planned by the various religious bodies, will then find place on the program. The Temple will be the rallying point at the Fair of all such groups, both those specifically under church auspices, and others inspired by similar ideals. Music, stressing the religious theme by great symphonic orchestras, soloists, choral groups, will have an important place. Organ music will be provided at other times and a system of loud speakers will bring all Tower auditorium programs to . . . the garden."

We believe this outline will convince you that far from being a "vague architectural tribute to 'religion' . . . without any lesson, meaning or significance," the Temple project will have profound implications and will be a potent means of arousing

Americans to guard and promote religious freedom as an integral principle of the democratic form of government.

New York, N. Y. JOHN GILLAND BRUNINI

FIREFLY

EDITOR: It is a pity that C. C. Martindale should have spoilt his article on the Proletarian State (AMERICA, February 19) by ending up with a slap at Catholics.

Burke said that you cannot bring an indictment against a whole people, and Catholics are more of a people than any mere nationality.

Catholics everywhere are having a tough time, which is about the only generalization you can make about them.

Speaking for myself and the kind of Catholics I know, what we crave is a little more sympathy and encouragement. Goodness knows we need it!

Winnipeg, Canada

F. F. EVANS

BOUQUET

EDITOR: Having just read the announcement about Father Blakely's one-thousandth article in AMERICA (February 26), I cannot let pass an occasion at once so Catholic and public without sending some message, however inadequate, to express my sense of Father Blakely's great services with the pen for every good cause and, most of all, the combat for Catholic education—the complete education of Catholic youth in Catholic schools.

From the very opening of those articles on education I may claim that I have always sought them out and read them carefully with a very practical purpose. Their facts have been of great service in my work, but still more have I endeavored to gain from their forms of exposition and argument what is no less needed than facts by any fellow-worker of Father Blakely in the campaign for integral Catholic education.

Dublin, Ireland

REV. T. CORCORAN, S.J.

PROTOCOLS

EDITOR: I. N. D. writes (March 5) that the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* have been completely discredited and declared a forgery by the High Court of Berne. I. N. D. evidently has not read of the recent decision of that court which reversed the 1935 verdict and acquitted the accused.

He completely misses the point when he cries out that they are a forgery, for a thing may be a forgery and still be true. In all fairness I think we

might consider the main points of the *Protocols*, that is, their predictions. Without holding any brief for them at all, we are forced to admit that their predictions so far have been borne out to the letter.

Most of the authorities on the question, Nesta Webster, Denis Fahey and other European writers of note, agree that both editions in circulation now have been copied from an earlier source but that their contents are the main point. First prove the contents false, I. N. D., and then you will have something!

Laurelton, N. Y.

JOHN J. SULGER

EDITOR: I. N. D. claims that the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are a forgery. The Jews think so. So does the London *Times* that gets its pap from the Jews.

Dr. Stephen Vasz, of Budapest, has examined this famous Berne trial. He calls it a mistrial and a farce.

In his book, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Father Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp., has this to say:

The ablest attempts to disprove its authenticity, viz., that of the *Times*, 1921, is open to serious objections. The authorship of the *Protocols* is mysterious, but it is an accidental consideration. What must be kept clearly in mind and emphasized throughout any discussion concerning the *Protocols* is the very grave fact that the program outlined in them is being fulfilled.

Address Withheld

READER

EDITOR: The letter of I. N. D. touches a point that is too frequently overlooked—namely, that there are Jews and Jews, just as there are Christians and Christians. It is a rather common fallacy to condemn a race or a religion because of a few.

A true Jew worships the true God and reveres His Commandments, and is not to be classed with godless men "who say they are Jews, and are not." Sincere Jews cannot but resent being compared to those who have abandoned the faith and the names of their fathers.

Not all Jews have strange gods before them. It is absurd to imply that every Jew is a Baruch Spinoza, holding the errors of Pantheism. My Jewish friends are certainly not like Nietzsche, who wrote *Anti-Christ* and raved about a super-man. Right-thinking Jews are far removed from the foul doctrine of Freud. The law maker of the Jewish people is not Karl Marx, author of *Das Kapital*.

It is one thing to say that anti-God Jews supply brains and money to Communism, and it is another thing to say that all Jews are Communists. Even if Leon Blum did say: "Judaism finds its highest and final expression in Socialism," it does not follow that all Jews agree with him. Trotsky, breathing forth intellectual streptococci, or Yaroslavsky, proclaiming hatred of Christians, cannot make us hate any Jews, not even Zinoviev or Litvinov. Why, even a contradiction like a Jewish-Nazi in no way includes a true American Hebrew.

Noxious and detestable internationalism is by no means the same as the Jewish nationality and the Jewish religion. A man whose country is where his

fortune happens to be differs from the American Hebrew we admire.

St. Mary's, Kans.

WM. E. ALLEN, S.J.

ENGLISH AT MASS

EDITOR: In a recent article (AMERICA, March 5) Father Donnelly hazards the guess that English was used at a Catholic Mass in America for the first time during the concelebration of the Byzantine Liturgy which was performed at the Capuchin Church in New York on Washington's Birthday.

It was, indeed, a real hazard; for I heard the Gospel sung in English on the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul in 1935. The place was Saint Mary's Carpatho-Russian Catholic Church in Hazleton, Pennsylvania. And from what I could gather, the practice is not at all uncommon among the members of the above group in the United States.

The ceremony of chanting the Gospel in various languages is always part of the Easter celebration in Byzantine Rite churches. I can well realize the shock experienced by the congregation when the priest in New York began the Gospel in English, for I was once equally amazed to hear the familiar opening of Saint John's Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word, etc.," sung in an unmistakably American accent at the Ruthenian Church in Rome.

Mundelein, Ill.

DESMOND A. SCHMAL, S.J.

EPIGRAM

EDITOR: I am reminded, on reading William Morgan Hannon's wishful thinking test-sentence (March 5), in which he uses the adjective *liberal* five times, of the warning of my old logic professor: "Under the full flood of liberalism, conviction washes out in a universal suds of hospitality. It is the nemesis of open-mindedness that the mind becomes a sieve and not a vessel."

New York, N. Y.

EDWARD D. REYNOLDS

OF, FOR, BY THE MAJORITY

EDITOR: I find it difficult to agree with Royal P. Jarvis (AMERICA, February 19).

The government should exist for a majority; the majority is the working class. Therefore, encourage labor unions. I prefer the C. I. O. Its set-up is more fair to employer and employe than the A. F. of L. If the C. I. O. has Communists in its ranks, let Catholic workers join it, bring in new blood, and overwhelm the Red element.

Mr. Jarvis says that unions are out to rook the public and that they will fall of their own weight when all workers belong. Now, the men in unions are the public. Let laborers have good living wages and hours, break up monopolies, and forbid excessive profits—then you will have a balanced ration that every citizen will be able to digest.

De Soto, Kans.

J. RODNEY CREWSE

LITERATURE AND ARTS

CURIOUS CULLINGS FROM A ONCE IMPORTANT REVIEW

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

IN a recent household clean-up there was turned out from the dusty shelves of a hold-all pantry a finely bound book that shows this title page: *Democratic Review*. Vol. XXX. New Series-Volume One. New York: D. W. Holly, Publisher. No. 170 Broadway. 1852. On this page also is inscribed, in a bold plain hand: "To Thomas Francis Meagher, from his warm friend T. Devin Reilly, Aug. 1852." The *Democratic Review*, a monthly magazine, started in Washington in 1837, was an official organ of the Democratic party of that era when there were no "fire-side chats"; no radio bureaucratic pronouncements; no Monday morning propaganda releases. The dear public of that horse-and-buggy age, when they wanted information on politics or the public issues of the day, read lengthy, pertinent essays in the *Democratic* and other reviews; or in formal pamphlet dissertations. The *Democratic Review* was later moved to New York, and John Louis O'Sullivan, one of the literary and political prominents of that time, was its editor.

T. Devin Reilly, an associate editor, was one of the most brilliant and ultra-radical of the historic group of the Young Ireland party of 1848, that blasted O'Connell's Constitutional Agitation program in Irish politics. His "warm friend," Thomas Francis Meagher, was the famous orator of the party, whose accidental drowning in the Missouri, July 1, 1867, was a tragic close to his splendid and varied tri-continental career as orator, publicist, and military and civic leader.

In 1837 Orestes A. Brownson decided to publish a review that would enable him to give his views of the questions of philosophy, religion, and social and moral progress. He called it the *Boston Quarterly Review*. It soon became an important factor in influencing public opinion. An article, in the issue of July, 1840, on *The Laboring Classes* startled the country. Much of it could be used by the commentators of today. He was also a contributor to the *Democratic Review* and O'Sullivan, recognizing his value, persuaded him with a two years' contract to merge both reviews and become a free and independent contributor to the *Democratic Review*. Brownson began with a series of articles on syn-

thetic philosophy, which type of topics, however, did not please the readers. At the editor's suggestion he turned to politics in several essays, which later rewritten and extended, made up his *American Republic*. The doctrines and opinions thus expressed brought a storm of protests from the subscribers to the *Democratic Review*. Martin Van Buren blamed the loss of a nomination for President largely to one of Brownson's articles. Finally, after continued complaints from O'Sullivan, Brownson decided to break off his connection with the *Democratic Review* and in January, 1844, he started *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, the historic periodical that established his international reputation as the foremost lay American exponent of Catholic thought. It continued with ever-increasing prestige until October, 1864, when insufficient patronage and the death of two of his sons determined him to stop its publication. He revived it in January, 1873, and finally suspended it at the end of 1875.

The efforts of this volume of the *Democratic Review* for 1852 were directed to securing for Franklin Pierce the nomination for President, at the democratic National Convention of that year. One of his rivals for this designation was Senator Lewis Cass of Michigan whose son, Lewis Cass, Jr., was then the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States to the Papal States. In a vicious and scurrilous article, *The Roman Republic—"Rome to America,"* written in the April issue, evidently by the associate editor, Devin Reilly (all the articles in the *Review* are anonymous) the sending by the Pope of a block of marble for the Washington Monument is made the basis of an attack on the Cass candidacy in an adroit implication that the Pope's present was an intrigue between "the Austrian Secretary of Pius IX" and Cass, Jr., to make votes for his father. The whole article teems with the most violent and scandalous diatribes against Cardinal Antonelli, the Pope's curia and his "French-Austrian jailers." Running along with it are fulsome eulogies of Mazzini's revolutionists, their alleged democratic ideals and the abortive "Roman Republic." It will be recalled that this block of marble sent by the Pope was stolen one night from the site of the Washing-

ton Monument, then in course of construction, by Know Nothing vandals and thrown into the Potomac river at Washington.

The radical anti-clerical views expressed in this article on the *Roman Republic* are to be found with equal virulence in a February contribution, *Revolution or Migration—the Irish Question*. Here the Irish Hierarchy and most of the seniors of the priesthood are stigmatized, as anti-nationalists, bribed by the English Government, treacherous to their country and disregardful of its interests. O'Connell and his leadership are held up to special obloquy. The *Liberator* was one of Devin Reilly's most violent antipathies all through his career as politician and publicist which ended at Washington, March 6, 1854.

The literary editor of the *Democratic Review* had his peculiarities, as might be assumed from a notice he gave Herman Melville's *Moby Dick, or the Whale* in the January issue. This is some of what he thought of it:

Mr. Melville is evidently trying to ascertain how far the public will consent to be imposed upon. He is gauging at once our gullibility and our patience. . . . Mr. Melville never writes naturally. His sentiment is forced, his wit is forced. The truth is Mr. Melville has survived his reputation . . . his vanity had destroyed all his chances of immortality, or even of a good name with his own generation. . . . If there are any of our readers who wish to find examples of bad rhetoric, involved syntax, stilted sentiment and incoherent English, we will take the liberty of recommending to them this precious volume of Mr. Melville's.

This was said eighty-six years ago. If its author could speak now, what would he think of his forecast of the fate of *Moby Dick*?

There is another article in this number on *Parlor Periodicals*, inveigling against a triad of Philadelphia periodicals, *Godey's Lady's Book*, *Sartain's Union Magazine of Literature and Art*, and *Graham's Magazine*, in which he says: "We are treated with a dish of literature for which we can devise no name . . . wondering that anything so inferior can commend itself, or be commended to the notice of sensible women."

Fashion plates and illustrations in such publications were his abomination. Said he: "As for fashion plates, when bound between the covers of a periodical they are simply ridiculous. The man has yet to live who shall discover the connection between fashion and literature"—with several pages more to prove this contention. In view of how Philadelphia, in the present generation, had done so much to promote the evolution of the fashion-literary magazine into a "national institution" it would seem as if the lesson sought thus to be imparted eighty-odd years ago fell on a very sterile field.

Another frequent contributor to the *Democratic Review* was Nathaniel Hawthorne. He and O'Sullivan became most intimate friends and so remained all his life time. The Hawthorne children called him "Uncle John," and he was Una's godfather. He once borrowed some money from Hawthorne and not being ready to repay it on the specified date asked an extension of time promising to pay additional interest. In answer Hawthorne wrote to him:

I entreat you to take your own time. As to interest, it sounds queer between you and me. If it will be of any easement to your mind, it is not worth while for me to object, but it deprives me of the pleasant feeling of having done you a kindness. . . . I will not lend you any money on interest, because then I should lose the security of your faith and honor, and make a mere commercial speculation of it and put myself in the same category as other usurers. But if you will borrow it as a friend, you can command every cent that I can spare.

John Louis O'Sullivan was United States Minister to Portugal, 1854-1858, and the Hawthornes made a long visit to him there during his term of that office. He was born, at sea, in 1813, while his father was United States Consul to the Barbary States. His grandfather, a former officer in the English army, settled in New York with his family after the Revolution. His father married a non-Catholic and allowed her to bring up his six children outside the Faith. He went to school in England and France, and returning to New York, received his Arts degrees at Columbia College, 1831-1835. He took an active interest in public affairs and his ability soon made him a leader. Before he went to Washington he served in the State legislature, and at the Capital his valuable party services were specially recognized. In President Polk's famous *Diary* his name is often mentioned, and President Pierce sent him as Minister to Portugal. When he returned to the United States he led a life of comfortable, leisurely ease until his death in 1895. Indifferent in religion because of the neglect of his early years, he was given the grace to return to the Faith of his fathers during the closing years of his long life.

His sister Adelaide, to whom he was devotedly attached, was a precocious child who had the good fortune to come under the influence of a Catholic seamstress employed in the family, who taught her the practices and fundamentals of her religion. Father Benedict Fenwick, S.J., a visitor at her home also promoted this, and, when the family moved to Washington, D. C., in 1835, she went to the Visitation Academy at Georgetown. She became a member of the Visitation Community in 1837, but not being satisfied she withdrew and went to Havana to enter a convent of Discalced Carmelites in October, 1840. Political troubles drove her to Central America where she was elected Prioress in 1888, and proved an important local influence. Politics again forced her to come to the United States. An effort to establish a Carmel in New York having failed, her brother John escorted her and her eleven companions to Spain. The Bishop of León placed them in an old monastery at Grajal del Campo. Here she governed the Community under the strict Rule of Saint Teresa, with great success until her death April 15, 1893. The diocesan Process for her beatification was begun some time before the sad social and political upheavals in Spain put a temporary end to all its normal life.

Thus, when peace returns, if the petition for Mother Adelaide's beatification is continued, with that for Mother Seton, old St. Peter's will have two candidates for the honors of the Altar, who were natives and residents in the parish of the Mother Church of New York.

BOOKS

WRITTEN WITH EYES ON HOLLYWOOD

ACTION AT AQUILA. By Hervey Allen. Farrar and Rinehart. \$2.50

THE great mistake of the partisans for and against Mr. Allen's gigantic *Anthony Adverse* was their assumption that it was a great piece of literature. Long before the book was printed an extensive advertising campaign had disposed readers, professional and otherwise, to regard the tedious novel as a prodigy. Consequently the real values and the real defects of *Anthony Adverse* were scarcely considered. This is not the case with *Action at Aquila*, which is offered as a Civil War romance with certain realistic overtones. It is an unpretentious book, well-written, episodic in its method, Hollywoodish in its melodrama and saved from banality by a judicious admixture of history, brilliant military description and a genuine disgust for the horrors of war, which nevertheless does not prevent the author from squeezing the last drop of excitement from the bloody slaughter.

Colonel Nathaniel Franklin, of the Sixth Pennsylvania Cavalry, is the Union's contribution to the lists of chivalry. As the hero of the book he is by no means inferior to Stephen Brice of *The Crisis* or the thousands of Confederate colonels who have galloped bravely in the pages of fiction. Through his eyes we witness the effect of the war on his friends and his enemies. As he rides back to his regiment he passes through the war zones in Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia, adventuring the while, pausing to spend a night with citizens of local prominence and providing the reader with the opportunity to soak himself in the atmosphere of the war. As for his romance with the widow of the Confederate Major whose home he had been forced to burn, the less said the better. One can almost hear the casting director clucking with joy.

The merits of the book do not pertain to the plot or to the characterization but to Mr. Allen's success in making the past come alive. Although the novel as a whole lacks the impact of a truly artistic story, its individual parts are sometimes breathlessly exciting. The two chapters on Sergeant Smith constitute an independent short story, and a host of minor characters are realized admirably. Mr. Allen has obviously taken great pains to provide an accurate historical background, even to the extent of making maps for our guidance. In return for all these excellent services one cannot be contemptuous. *Action at Aquila* belongs to the class of the little shepherds of kingdom come, but it is also among the very best of that class.

FRANCIS X. CONNOLLY

FROM JUSTINIAN TO SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS

SEVEN CENTURIES OF THE PROBLEM OF CHURCH AND STATE. By Frank Gavin. Princeton University Press. \$2

THE seven centuries are those that separated Justinian in the sixth from Saint Thomas in the thirteenth; but the story is carried back to the age of the Apostles and projected down to our own. The lesson to be learned is that, if we are wise, we may learn something from the Middle Ages. The author finds four "ways in which the adjustment between Church and State may be achieved": "parity of powers," "theocracy," "the alleged indepen-

dence of Church from State," the way in which "the State triumphs over the Church."

Justinian's role is studied at length and is found to be fourfold: he envisaged a single organized society including both Church and State, he Christianized the classic tradition of law, "in a sense that cannot be gainsaid, he was head of the Church," he stood for the principle of religious intolerance. Gregory VII is presented in the now old-fashioned and somewhat faded picture of the typical "theocrat." The poorest part of the book is that devoted to John of Salisbury and Saint Bernard of Clairvaux; the best, the dozen pages given to Saint Thomas.

A Catholic reader will be struck by the not inconsiderable attention given to such Catholic writers and scholars as Bullough, Chesterton, Fliche, Gilson, Grabmann, Przywara, Rickaby, Sertillanges, J. J. Walsh and Maurice De Wulf. On the other hand there are some amazing omissions: not a mention of the fundamental work of Hergenröther on the general problem, nor of Arquillière's illuminating studies of *Augustinisme politique* and of Gregory VII, nor even of Rivière's classical study of the problem in the time of Boniface VIII.

There are several astonishing statements: as, to give but a single example, that "the Hildebrandian theory . . . has been carried . . . into modern times by the Society of Jesus." Obviously Dr. Gavin has not studied his Suarez and Bellarmine. The author holds that "the problem of sovereignty is the real axis about which the whole controversy arises." This is not so. The real axis is the nature and end, temporal and eternal, of man.

GERALD G. WALSH

MATCHLESS LEARNING OF GILSON, METAPHYSICIAN

THE UNITY OF PHILOSOPHICAL EXPERIENCE. By Etienne Gilson. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.75

THE STUDENT of the history of philosophy, especially of the modern period, may well be pardoned for turning skeptic. The parade of contemporary and successive "philosophies" is apt to awaken anxious thoughts in the minds of the most faithful. Does the history of philosophy make sense? Is there any thread of union, even the most frail, perceptible in the crazy quilt? Or are we, forsooth, to limit ourselves for explanation to the history, time, country, social factors of the philosophers? *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* answers such questions—and with a decisive affirmative to the first.

Professor Gilson in this work—the lectures given at Harvard in the fall of 1936—supplies us with the unity. It is that of being, the unity of being, the law or principle of being that imposes itself imperiously, even when sinned against, on every entrant to the Temple of Philosophy. Of course, all who have kept in touch with the Neo-Scholastic movement are familiar with this cardinal idea. It remained, however, for the distinguished historian of medieval and modern philosophy to trace its workings in history with all the deftness and clarity we are led to associate with his name. A threefold experiment in philosophy provides the field of inquiry. That there is an abstract philosophical determinism ruling the philosophies is shown in Abelard, who fell foul of Logicism (identifying logic with philosophy), the Arabians and Christian theologians who stumbled over Theologism (clothing theology in a garb of philosophy), and finally Ockham who showed the way to Skepticism by his Psychologism and Theologism. Descartes furnishes the second experiment, his Mathematicism, undue Spiritual-

ism and Idealism, opening a still wider breach in the philosophical rampart. The moderns supply the third experiment with Kant's Physicism and Moralism, and Comte's Sociologism throwing new light on the metaphysical determinism whereby "Philosophy buries its undertakers."

In the last chapter, which should be made obligatory reading in every advanced course of philosophy, Professor Gilson, by way of recapitulation, offers a matchless analysis and synthesis of the preceding chapters, terminating with seven principles or laws that may well serve as a sort of Dantean motto over the Temple of Philosophy, a warning to future aspirants. The reviewer regrets space-limits prohibit an examination of this chapter, which contains in very truth the marrow of scholastic metaphysics. Gilson had already won his spurs as a historian; his later works, noticeably the present, insure him a place of honor among the philosophers of the Revival of Scholasticism. That concluding lecture, which incidentally must have delighted his Harvard audience, shows him a keen metaphysician as well as historian. He lays down principles that may well be heeded by all historians. In it are lessons that should not be lost on our own Catholic schools of philosophy.

Delivered to non-Scholastics, this series of lectures will be appreciated by Catholics of the school. Historians of philosophy will find many lights in the treatment of the philosophers and philosophies examined. Whether you consider the content or the form, this is a book to enhance its author's reputation and to delight the reader. In it are combined clarity of thought, felicity of expression, united to a rare depth of penetration of the principles that underlie all knowledge. WILLIAM J. BENN

GOOD IN SPOTS AND BAD IN OTHERS

JOURNALIST'S WIFE. By Lilian T. Mowrer, William Morrow and Co. \$3.50

AS the wife of America's famous correspondent, Mrs. Mowrer has probably seen as much of life as any woman living. She was in Italy during the Caporetto disaster, and she is pretty near the truth in her estimate of the causes of that set-back. She was in Italy, too, when the Fascists made their march on Rome; and it is clear that she has no more liking for Fascism than she has for Hitler's Nazism, which she observed at close quarters on the spot. She visited Russia, and saw a good deal there, among other things the state absolutism from which both German and Italian totalitarianism derive.

In France where her husband had been assigned by his paper, the activities of the *Front Populaire* aroused her admiration; and when duty called to Spain she found the *Frente Popular* equally admirable. Indeed, one seems to get the impression that much as she abominates Stalinism and all its works, Mrs. Mowrer harbors an idea that possibly Communism is the lesser of two evils, that may quite likely rescue the peoples from Fascism of all kinds.

Both by training and experience Mrs. Mowrer has acquired the art of saying succinctly exactly what she wants to say, even if she is not always entirely aware of what she is talking about. It is silly to dismiss the work of Paul Claudel as soaked in prejudice, just because he is a Catholic; and it is naive credulity to relate how the Cardinal Archbishop of Boston expressed his admiration for the Papal Coronation in a strong Irish brogue, whilst he declaimed that Ziegfeld could have managed the show better.

It makes you wonder how the narrator got hold of all these inside things. How, for instance, she learned just which way "the Vatican" thought the war was going to end, and didn't; how far she is factual or is just fantastically subjective when she states, quite categorically, that Pope Pius XI gave an emphatic denial

to an extremely undiplomatic and imprudent statement that Cardinal Ratti was alleged to have made to a newspaperman just before the Conclave. The notion of the Roman Pontiff ignominiously eating his own words, on the threat of an American press correspondent to broadcast a statement to the anti-clerical press of Italy is staggering, if one is addicted to the staggers!

Except for the account of a visit to Teresa Neumann at Konnersreuth, which is respectfully and reverently written, the impression clings that this writer has a covert dislike for Catholics and Catholicism.

RICHARD TURPIN

BOOKS IN BRIEFER REVIEW

GOLD-DUSTY. By Vera Marie Tracy. The Bruce Publishing Co. \$1.50

ETCHED IN WORDS. By Gertrude Ryder Bennett. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2

THE GOLDEN FLAME. By Gertrude Jane Codd. St. Anthony Guild Press. \$1.25

IT is difficult to criticize a book which is dedicated to "Dearest Jesus." So, Miss Tracy's little volume. Art is such a small, trivial thing compared to saintliness! I must confess I enjoyed every line she offers us here, even despite the fact that the title of the book is so bad, even despite the fact that "brought-Magnificat" is a very bad rhyme, and "chimneys-whimseys" even a worse one. Occasionally the poet's skill approaches the unmistakable quality of her holiness; and knowing, *ex aliunde*, that her life is lived in a wheel-chair, one must feel that this hardship is very well expressed in the lines:

Bound hand and foot—her seeming sorry lot—
She does not freedom crave. He tied the knot.

Miss Bennett has frequently appeared in the columns of AMERICA. And feeling that we would be especially proud of her, now in a book, brought her volume to us in person. We were very proud of her. She is an extremely good versifier and has at times a surprising power of observation. I liked best her poem called *Mary*. I give the first two stanzas, not the third, and think the poem ought to end there.

I wish her words had come to us
Her version, simply done—
As any mother might have told
The story of her son.

How powerful the vivid lines
That Christ's disciples wrote!
But what of all the words they thought
Too trivial to quote.

Miss Codd, who has appeared in almost every other Catholic magazine in this country, has never appeared in AMERICA; though, upon reading this quatrain:

Oh, little lass with Irish eyes,
God bless you for your grace—
You'll never know how many dreams
You sold me with your lace

one rather wishes that she had. LEONARD FEENEY

THE CROSS AND THE CRISIS. By Fulton J. Sheen. The Bruce Publishing Co. \$2

MONSIGNOR SHEEN has added another worthwhile book to his rapidly growing list, some twenty-two in all. In the preface of *The Cross and the Crisis* he expresses in his usual picturesque style his present thesis: "the crisis facing the world today is not so much political and economic, as it is moral and religious. The crux of the crisis is the cross."

He interprets the parable of the Prodigal Son and finds the wanderer to be Western civilization, "the spirit of a culture divorced from traditional Christianity, which is Catholicism. The Catholic Church still continued to live

THEATRE

in Western civilization but it was not permitted to be its inspiration." This prodigal son gradually squandered his spiritual heritage. To recoup this inheritance, he must enter into himself and raise his "standards in the light of the cross." But traditional Christianity, the Father's house, has its stern duty: "We are our brother's keeper. . . . The choice is clear: either Western civilization will have a revolution of Violence or a revolution of Love . . . Christianity, as Chesterton has suggested, yet remains to be tried."

Monsignor Sheen is happy in his quotations from contemporary authorities. Rightly, of course, the Papal Encyclicals are his solid foundation, but non-Catholic as well as Catholic writings help construct his building. While his style tends to the oratorical, Monsignor Sheen's book is easy reading for the grave problem discussed.

D. J. O'CONNELL

TODAY IS YOURS. By Emilie Loring. Little, Brown and Co. \$2

GOOD, light fiction aptly qualifies Emilie Loring's latest contribution, *Today Is Yours*. Take it with you on your summer vacation and you will not regret it. It will keep you in a cheerful frame of mind. Brian Romney, separated for a year from his charming wife, is summoned home by his uncle to assume the leadership of the Romneys as president of the family manufacturing business. At the same time the wise old Major asks Gay, Brian's wife, to come as mistress of Rosewynne, the family mansion, until Brian is firmly established as head of the family. How the estranged couple succeed in putting on a "married front" and the happy outcome constitute the particular charm of the story. Some of the details are too far-fetched for credibility and the mechanical contrivances toward the happy solution bear an air of improbability. Nevertheless, it is a whole-some story and the characters, especially the Major, are rather well drawn.

ALBERT WHELAN

THE SPRING OF JOY. By Mary Webb. E. P. Dutton and Co. \$3

THIS attractively bound book of almost four hundred pages has introductions by Walter de la Mare and Martin Armstrong, and is very beautifully illustrated with rustic views and decorative head and tail pieces by Norman Hepple. It contains reprints of the unfinished novel *Armour Wherein He Trusted* and of several short stories, a group of sketches and a largish collection of poems. So many forms of writing set here in juxtaposition prove at a glance the versatility of Mary Webb's powers, while a few hours' reading explains her popularity both before and after the appearance of *Precious Bane*. It is to be regretted that her moral outlook sometimes inclined towards the hazy as in *Caer Cariad* and the powerful *Blessed are the Meek*. She was at her happiest writing of the land, homely detail and simple lives; she lived very close to nature and could transcribe the still sad music of humanity.

PAULA KURTH

MARY THE MOTHER OF JESUS. By Rev. Franz Michel Willam. B. Herder Book Co. \$3

SCARCITY of source material has kept Marian biography from striding on apace with the enormous advance in hagiography. Most accounts of the life of our Lady fall in coordination and insight: they are either wholly imaginative and legendary, or remain satisfied with a strict recounting of fact and incident, so scantily recorded. There was needed an alert, clear-sighted interpreter to construct and expand harmoniously. This is what Dr. Willam set himself to accomplish, and the outcome is an admirable production combining research and intuitive acumen. Throughout there is displayed a penetrating insight and scrutiny into the character and life of Mary, which he carefully studies in the light of the Old Testament and the Psalms in particular so influential on her development in sanctity. There is evident also a deep probing of the meager Gospel accounts, to which is joined a profound knowledge of Palestine, its history and customs.

GERARD E. BRAUN

THE HILL BETWEEN. The hill between, in Robert Porterfield's production of Lulu Volmer's new play at the Little Theatre, is the lack of understanding between Southern mountaineers and their visitors from the outer world. There is just such a hill. Unfortunately Miss Volmer has not shown it to us in her play as she did so clearly some years ago in *Sun Up*. Her present hill is an ant hill, and not even her sincerity and earnestness can make it anything else. Miss Volmer, who is supposed to understand so well the minds and hearts of mountain people, is as artless as they are when it comes to understanding their emotional reaction to visitors from the cities.

Her big situation, if you will believe it, is that a single kiss, offered to a mountain boy by a big-city woman flirt, almost costs the boy and his mountain fiancée their lives! They take it so seriously that each tries to commit suicide. While the girl is being saved in a cabin, another rescuer rushes to the aid of the boy, who seeks to make his exit from life out in the great open spaces. It is at this point that audiences titter unfeelingly, and who can blame them? The episode is so far-fetched, so remote from life in any setting, that it cannot be taken seriously.

The audience is rightly convinced that it would not be taken so seriously even in the mountains. The lovers had been happy in their love before the city vampire came along. In real life, the boy would have kissed her, given the opportunity; and the girl, seeing him do it as she did in the play, would be both jealous and unhappy. Realizing her unhappiness, the boy would undoubtedly feel remorseful and conscience-stricken. But, in real life, even in the Southern mountains, neither of them would have attempted suicide as the only way out of the situation. By insisting that they would, the author makes her hero and heroine fools, and assumes that her spectators are also fools.

They are not. They know more than the author does about that situation. They know that if every young mountaineer who was vamped by a siren killed himself because he kissed her, the fastnesses of the Southern mountains would be cluttered with the remains of impulsive youths. In real life there would be, in the mountains as elsewhere, a lovers' quarrel over that kiss and in due time a pleasant reconciliation. Hearing about the would-be suicides, audiences settle back in their chairs and gurgled into happy laughter. There can be no "drama" after that. The spectators have discovered that they know more about human nature than the playwright does. The fact explains the disastrous failure of a dozen recent plays. Audiences were asked to accept episodes and characters basically false.

WHO'S WHO. Much can be said in favor of Elsa Maxwell's production of Leonard Silliman's revue, *Who's Who*, at the Hudson Theatre. The first arresting discovery is that Miss Maxwell does not spread caricatures of New York celebrities all over her curtain, as she must have been urged to do. Herself an incomparable show-woman she realizes that the flavor of novelty was brushed from that feature long ago. In the second place, she has given us an extremely good show, which we are able to enjoy now that the fear of caricatures is off our minds. The revue is admirably set, dressed and acted. It is sung and danced with abandon and ability. It is modern to its last note and final toe-tap. Imogene Coca alone is worth the price of admission. The only numbers I was not enthusiastic about were the Harlem Negro songs and dances. They could have been better. But with my hand on my heart I maintain that as a whole *Who's Who* is capital entertainment.

ELIZABETH JORDAN

FILMS

THE GIRL OF THE GOLDEN WEST. David Belasco's play about the hard-riding citizens of young California, which served as entertainment some thirty years ago, has become increasingly artificial with each resuscitation on stage and screen. It never really survived its numbing contact with operatic conventions and, faced with the new limitations of screen operetta, it dwindles into the most devitalized of libretti. For an essential cowboy melodrama, it insists on riding a pretty high horse, what with Sigmund Romberg music and dances supervised by Albertina Rasch. The familiar action continues to involve the fair proprietress of a gold-town saloon in a two-headed romance with law and disorder, represented by an ardent sheriff and a highly vocal Mexican bandit. The fact that almost everybody sings splendidly makes the plot less noticeable than ever. Jeanette MacDonald and Nelson Eddy provide interludes of musical brilliance, the former especially in solo renditions of *Ave Maria* and *Liebestraum*, but they can do little toward making the picture convincing drama. Director Robert Z. Leonard has spent too much time in creating an atmospheric setting for a static, unimportant story but the Romberg score and interpolations, plus hard work by Walter Pidgeon and Leo Carillo, make the film respectable family fare. (MGM)

THE FIRST HUNDRED YEARS. The thesis of this domestic drama seems to be that the difficulties which beset the proverbial first year of married life often last much longer. The particular problem which clouds this household is a clash of careers and a good deal of witty and knowing amusement is wrung from it. When a proud husband, who has been supported by his wife's earnings for some time, is finally given a chance to carve out a career of his own in shipbuilding, he finds his spouse unwilling to assume a subordinate role in erecting the house beautiful. Separation follows and the inevitable search for new alliances but a temporary reunion for the sake of convenience turns out to be a permanent reconciliation. The theme of the piece is handled with enough humor to shield it from criticism as a social document. Richard Thorp directed with smartness rather than sincerity in view, if we can judge from results. Robert Montgomery lends a degree of freshness to an old portrait, supported by Virginia Bruce. (MGM)

JEZEBEL. A large scale production and much advance drum-beating cannot conceal the fact that the producers have taken Owen Davis' slight play and made a monumentally unimportant motion picture of it. It has its share of Dixie atmosphere, stiffened toward the end with a really dramatic background of plague. The story is dependent on a central character whose mixture of malice and charm is worthy of the *belle dame* of a pre-Raphaelite poet but inappropriate in a realistic drama such as William Wyler has attempted. The heroine alienates her fiancé's affections by a breach of Southern convention but refuses to give him up even after he has married another. Her schemes bring tragedy upon all and, when the dread yellow jack strikes, she accompanies the man she loves into virtual exile, not so much to make amends, perhaps, as to persist in having her way. Bette Davis gives a spirited reading of an overdrawn and obscurely motivated vixen, assisted by Henry Fonda. The film is adult fare. (Warner)

BULLDOG DRUMMOND'S PERIL. This is the most exciting and plausible of the current series of detective yarns lionizing the resourceful Captain Drummond. John Barrymore and John Howard uncover a diamond theft and an incidental murder in this family thriller. (Paramount)

THOMAS J. FITZMORRIS

EVENTS

THE British Government asked the Pope to intercede with Franco, sent a formal protest to the Franco Spanish regime over the Barcelona air attacks. . . . In Washington, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, following the lead of the London Foreign Office, declared in a carefully prepared statement: ". . . I feel I am speaking for the whole American people when I voice a sense of horror at what has taken place at Barcelona. . . ." Sixty-one Protestant Episcopal and Methodist Bishops signed their names to a transparent piece of Communist propaganda, which demanded that the American Catholic Hierarchy have the Barcelona bombing stopped at once as though the Hierarchy controlled the sky traffic. . . .

In a Broadway play, *Our Town*, the last act shows a cemetery scene. The stage is filled with the dead of a New England village. . . . Let us imagine a vaster stage—the stage of the world, filled with dead. . . . "Who are you?" we ask a group. "We are the dead who died in Barcelona. Has there been any outcry at our deaths?" "Yes, yes," we assure them, "a world-wide outcry. The British Government, Secretary Hull, Episcopal and Methodist Bishops, the American papers have all protested." Other groups of dead are listening. . . . "Who are you?" we inquire of another division. "We are the dead who died in the villages of India bombed not long ago by British aviators," they chorus. "Has there been a burst of protest? Has Secretary Hull expressed a sense of horror? Have the American papers editorialized on the barbarity of British aviators?" "No, no," we are forced to answer, "no, no." We can give them no comfort. . . . We address another group. "Who are you?" we ask. "We are the dead who died in the Arab settlements bombed by British air raiders," they cry. "Has any nation asked the Pope to intercede with Britain? Secretary Hull, has he given voice to a sense of horror? The Protestant Bishops, the American papers, have they—" "No, no," we are compelled to say, "no, no." . . . We question a still vaster throng. "Who are you?" "We are the dead who were killed in Huesca, Salamanca, Seville, other Nationalist towns when Russian, French and Spanish Reds bombed our cities," they answer. "We heard what you told the Barcelona dead. The British Government and Secretary Hull, they have protested our deaths, too?" "No, no," we hang our heads. "But why, why," shout the dead, "why do they feel horror over Barcelona and not about us?" We stand silent; we cannot answer. How could we make it clear to them? "But the Episcopal and Methodist Bishops, they are Christians. Did they not protest when Communists dropped bombs on us Christian non-combatants?" "No, no." This is all we can say. "The American papers, they did not protest?" "No, no, not about you. Only over Barcelona." . . . And now we see the greatest multitude of all. Endless files of dead. A veritable forest of corpses. "Who are you?" we ask. "We are the priests and nuns massacred by the Loyalists in Red Spain," they respond. "The civilized world must have been stunned by such wholesale butchery?" We say nothing. We cannot tell them the truth. "The protest of the British Government must have been energetic?" they cry. We cannot always remain silent. We can only say: "No, no. There was no British protest." "But Secretary Hull, surely Secretary Hull, speaking for the whole American people, must have cried out his horror at the brutal slaughter of so many of us priests and nuns." We can only answer: "No, no, Secretary Hull voiced no horror over the murder of you priests and nuns; his horror was expressed only for Barcelona." "But the American magazines and newspapers, the Protestant Bishops," these lines of butchered priests and nuns cannot understand. "No, no, no," we must tell the truth. "Nothing for you. Just for Barcelona." THE PARADER

